

OFFICIALLY ADOPTED
JULY 21, 1975

CRIMINAL JUSTICE

PREPARED BY

CENTRAL NAUGATUCK VALLEY
REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
20 EAST MAIN STREET
WATERBURY, CONN. 06702

JULY, 1975

701 PROJECT: CONNECTICUT CPA-CT-01-00-1034

THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT WAS FINANCED
IN PART THROUGH AN URBAN PLANNING GRANT FROM
THE U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION
701 OF THE HOUSING ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED;
BY A REGIONAL PLANNING GRANT FROM THE
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ENERGY POLICY,
STATE OF CONNECTICUT; AND BY CONTRIBUTIONS
FROM MEMBER MUNICIPALITIES OF THE CENTRAL
NAUGATUCK VALLEY REGION.

TITLE: CRIMINAL JUSTICE ELEMENT 1975

AUTHOR: CENTRAL NAUGATUCK VALLEY REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

SUBJECT: A summary of police, court and correctional program data giving crime rates, cost of crime information, Regional crime issues and trends in the CNVR and its municipalities.

DATE: July, 1975

LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY: Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Planning Agency

SOURCE OF COPIES: All libraries of the municipalities of the Central Naugatuck Valley Region

State Library
State of Connecticut
Hartford, Connecticut

HUD Library
Washington, D.C.

Library of Congress
Washington, D.C.

HUD PROJECT NO.: CPA-CT-01-00-1034

SERIES NO.: n.a.

NUMBER OF PAGES: 68

ABSTRACT: This report is a compilation of police, court and correctional program data on the amount of crime, the cost of crime, location of crime, rate of crime, disposition of offenders and the recidivism rate for the Central Naugatuck Valley Region and its municipalities. The tables present information on past trends and current conditions as well as an analysis of critical crime problems in the Region. The data contained in the tables include police department and State police reports, court statistics, municipal expenditure data and U.S. Census information.

XV-C. Criminal Justice

1. Introduction	XV-C-1
2. Street Crime in Waterbury	XV-C-4
a. Profile of Offenders	XV-C-7
b. Cost and Location of Crime in Waterbury	XV-C-8
c. Racial Imbalance of the Waterbury Police Department	XV-C-13
d. Detection and Apprehension of Offenders	XV-C-15
e. Larger Issues Affecting Crime in Waterbury	XV-C-17
3. Narcotics and Drug Abuse in Waterbury	XV-C-21
a. Profile of Drug Offenders	XV-C-23
b. Drug Abuse and Street Crime	XV-C-24
c. Disposition of Offenders	XV-C-26
4. Organized Police Departments in the Region	XV-C-27
a. Street Crime in the Suburban Municipalities	XV-C-29
b. Rate of Crime in the Region	XV-C-32
c. Cost of Crime in the Region	XV-C-34
d. Police Service and Functions	XV-C-36
e. Manpower and Training	XV-C-39
f. Communication and Information Systems in the Suburban Municipalities	XV-C-41
5. The Judicial System	XV-C-43
a. Processing of Cases	XV-C-44
b. Disposition of those arrested for Street Crimes	XV-C-49
6. The Rehabilitation of Offenders	XV-C-50
a. Correctional Institutions	XV-C-51
b. Recidivism in Waterbury	XV-C-52
c. Manpower	XV-C-52
d. Reintegration into Community	XV-C-53

e. Diversion Programs	XV-C-54
f. Recent Rehabilitation Programs	XV-C-56
7. Regional Criminal Justice Action Grants	XV-C-56
a. Ranking of State and Regional Criminal Justice Problems	XV-C-60
Policies	XV-C-63
Bibliography	XV-C-76
d. Detection and Apprehension of Offenders	XV-C-15
e. Larger Issues Affecting Crime in Waterbury	XV-C-17
3. Narcotics and Drug Abuse in Waterbury	XV-C-21
a. Profile of Drug Offenders	XV-C-23
b. Drug Abuse and Street Crime	XV-C-24
c. Disposition of Offenders	XV-C-26
4. Organized Police Departments in the Region	XV-C-27
a. Street Crime in the Suburban Municipalities	XV-C-29
b. Rate of Crime in the Region	XV-C-32
c. Cost of Crime in the Region	XV-C-34
d. Police Service and Functions	XV-C-36
e. Manpower and Training	XV-C-39
f. Communication and Information Systems in the Suburban Municipalities	XV-C-41
5. The Judicial System	XV-C-43
a. Processing of Cases	XV-C-44
b. Disposition of those arrested for Street Crimes	XV-C-49
6. The Rehabilitation of Offenders	XV-C-50
a. Correctional Institutions	XV-C-51
b. Recidivism in Waterbury	XV-C-52
c. Manpower	XV-C-52
d. Reintegration into Community	XV-C-53

C. CRIMINAL JUSTICE

1. INTRODUCTION

As a result of the passage of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act in 1968¹ the State of Connecticut established the Connecticut Planning Committee on Criminal Administration (CPCCA). The purpose of the Act was to provide financial assistance to the 50 states to combat crime, but in order to be eligible for these federal funds the Act required that each state create a state criminal justice planning agency and develop an annual comprehensive plan.

The emergence of the Connecticut Planning Committee on Criminal Administration reflects a growing awareness on the part of the police, the courts, the correctional centers and the public that crime must be dealt with in a coordinated and planned way. The wide variety of public and private organizations involved with the criminal justice system has made it imperative that systemwide comprehensive planning be undertaken. The President's Crime Commission recommended that systemwide planning was necessary to strengthen at the very least the

"ad hoc coordination among police, courts, and corrections agencies so that policies implemented in one part of the system would not have an adverse effect on other components. An increase in police officers, in a jurisdiction, for example, would require planning for increased work loads in courts and corrections operations to insure smooth processing of an increased number of arrestees."²

In the past, efforts to reduce crime were often confined to simple measures such as increasing the size of a municipality's police force or increasing the expenditures made for police protection. Even today it appears that police departments are all too eager to overemphasize their own role in the prevention of crime, while forgetting the role played by other organizations in branches inside and

outside the criminal justice system.

Because of the negative effect that the emphasis on criminal offenders this section of the Public Safety Element addresses itself

to all facets of the criminal justice process. Efforts to improve

¹National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals

Criminal Justice System, Washington, D.C. 1973, p. 5.

²Ibid., p. 6.

There is a wide variety of organizations which play a role in the criminal justice system of Connecticut and the Region. Within the State crime is a problem that is dealt with by the police, the courts, the correctional institutions, probation officers, drug treatment centers, half-way houses, schools and private organizations. In the Central Naugatuck Valley Region crime may initially be dealt with by a police officer, school superintendent, a private organization (in the case of such offenses as drug abuse and alcoholism) or by a family member. In most cases every effort possible is made to divert offenders from the arrest process if viable alternatives are available. Similarly, once an individual is arrested, generally every effort possible is made to reduce the charge against

the defendant in order to remove the burden of caseloads from the courts and reduce the amount of pretrial detention time served by the defendants. Finally, in recent years the courts have attempted to reduce the number of individuals confined in state prisons in an effort to reduce the costs and improve the

treatment of rehabilitation programs. As a result of this filtering process an individual who actually passes through all stages of the criminal justice process and ends up in a correctional institution (i.e. prison) is more than likely to be a seasoned criminal or long time offender. In turn, efforts made to correct the offender's criminal outlook become progressively less effective as he or she passes through each successive stage of the criminal justice process. The end result is that those individuals who have passed through the traditional rehabilitation programs and are released to the community are the most likely to commit crime. Rather than making "honest citizens" out of former criminals the criminal justice system has to a great extent functioned as a school for professionalizing the amateur offender.

Because of the negative effect that the courts and correctional system may have on criminal offenders this section of the Public Safety Element addresses itself to all facets of the criminal justice process. Efforts to improve public safety through increased deployment of police can never be effective if the remainder

of the criminal justice system fails to alter the criminal outlook of those the police have arrested. This view was corroborated by the National Advisory

Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. It indicated that,

"The responsibility for crime problems in most urban areas remains fragmented. The day has come, when the police alone cannot make a decisive impact on crime. More and more police chiefs and mayors are recognizing that what corrections, courts, schools, and social welfare agencies do in relation to their clients affects crime as much as police activity."³

In order to respond to the broad framework of the criminal justice system in the Central Naugatuck Valley Region this report is divided into six sections. They are (1) Street Crime in Waterbury, (2) Narcotics and Drug Abuse in Waterbury, (3) Street Crime in the Remainder of the Region, (4) the Judicial system, (5)

the rehabilitation of offenders and (6) Regional criminal justice funding programs. Waterbury has been dealt with separately from the remainder of the Region because its crime problems are not comparable to those found in the 12 other municipalities. Because of Waterbury's size (113,400 population) and its unique social and economic problems, a separate more detailed analysis has been made of its street crime problem.

Percent of Street Crime Occurring on the Street

<u>Percent of Occurrence on or Near the Street</u>		<u>Crimes Against Persons</u>	
90%		Robbery	
55%		Aggravated Assault	
70%		Other Assaults	
		<u>Crimes Against Property</u>	
100%		Burglary	
100%		Larceny	
100%		Auto Theft	

Source: CPCCA Street Crime, Order Maintenance and Police Service Functions, 1972.

³Ibid., p.15.

2. STREET CRIME IN WATERBURY

Street crime is defined as crimes against persons or property which occur on or near the street and is the most commonly used indicator of a municipality's crime problem. These crimes include robbery, assault, burglary, larceny and auto theft and are the principal crimes affecting public safety within a city. While other crimes such as rape and homicide are most often associated with dangerous forms of urban street crime these offenses are generally the least frequently reported offenses and, as a general rule, they rarely occur on or near the street. Nevertheless, these two crimes may account for the greatest part of the public's fear of crime.

Since homicides and forcible rapes are said to have a high rate of prior victim offender relationship--79 percent of all homicides and 66 percent of all rapes⁴--these crimes fall somewhat out of the domain of public safety in general and street crime in particular. In contrast to homicide and forcible rape, the crimes defined as street crimes offer the public and the police a greater role in their prevention. The FBI and the National Opinion Research Center give the following estimates of the percentages of these offences that occur on or near the street:

Percent of Street Crime Occurring on the Street

<u>Crimes Against Persons</u>	<u>Percent of Occurrence on or Near the Street⁵</u>
Robbery	90%
Aggravated Assault	55%
Other Assaults	70%
<u>Crimes Against Property</u>	
Burglary	100%
Larceny	100%
Auto Theft	100%

Source: CPCCA Street Crime, Order Maintenance and Police Service Functions, 1972.

⁴Connecticut Planning Committee on Criminal Administration, Street Crime, Order Maintenance and Police Service Functions, Hartford, Conn. 1972, p.3.

⁵Ibid, p.4.

Other crimes that are often connected with street activity such as prostitution and selling narcotics are dealt with in a later section of the report since they fall into crimes against public policy and cannot be as easily brought under the street crime heading. Street crimes unlike prostitution and narcotics sales create a fear of crime which is almost as important a part of the "crime problem" as the actual occurrence. According to the Connecticut Planning Committee on Criminal Administration,

"The perception of crime by the public and, in particular, of street crime appears to be a major element in causing fear and feelings of insecurity among people."⁶

Waterbury as the largest city in the Central Naugatuck Valley Region has the greatest share of all reported street crimes. In this regard Waterbury's street crime problem reflects the problems of all large urban areas. According to the National Opinion Research Center, metropolitan centers have violent crime rates that are about five times as high as smaller cities and rural areas and a property crime rate twice as high as the surrounding rural areas.⁷ These findings appear to be in keeping with the street crime problem found in Waterbury and the surrounding Region.

In recent years street crimes have continued to be a serious problem for the Waterbury Police Department and the public in general. Since 1968 the Waterbury Police Department has reported dramatic increases in all five offenses associated with street crime. As can be seen from the following Table between 1968 and 1974 robberies increased 26 percent, assaults increased 75 percent, burglaries increased 49 percent, larcenies increased 196 percent and auto theft, 80 percent. While the problem of street crime has worsened over the last six years, it appears that 1971 and 1974 were the worst years for all of these offenses. Burglaries and larcenies have accounted for the greatest proportion of all street crime

⁶Ibid., p.3

⁷National Opinion Research Center, Field Surveys II: Criminal Victimization in the United States: A Report of a National Survey. (U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1967), pp. 29-30.

offenses and have increased at a faster rate than any other street crimes. In fact, between 1973 and 1974 larcenies increased 84 percent and burglaries 40.9 percent which was the greatest annual increase recorded for these crimes for any year since 1968.

Number of Actual Offenses Associated With Street Crime
Reported or Known to Waterbury Police Department
1968 - 1974

Offense Classifi- cation	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	Percent Increase 1968-1974
Robbery	91	111	125	175	223	174	115	26.4%
All Assaults	313	385	485	539	546	473	549	75.4%
Burglary	1,209	1,285	1,390	1,499	1,435	1,280	1,803	49.1%
Larceny	1,161	1,456	1,582	2,081	1,847	1,868	3,437	196.0%
Auto Theft	469	1,015	810	1,110	923	718	842	79.5%

Source: Waterbury Police Department, Annual Reports, 1968-1974.

However, there is reason to believe that there were many more crimes that were never reported to the Waterbury Police Department. Certainly the low clearance rates for street crimes in the year prior to 1972 (see page XV-C-16) may have led Waterbury residents to believe that police assistance could do little to rectify their personal or property losses. However, this view was not entirely corroborated by a report prepared by the Waterbury Chamber of Commerce undertaken in 1973. It found that more personal reasons related to the victim's relationship to the offender may have been more important. In a survey of over 150 residents of the City that had been victims of crime in the last six months, the Chamber of Commerce found that 20 percent of the respondents never reported the crime to the police. Of those who did not report crimes, the primary reasons for not reporting were: "it was a private matter" (40 percent), "don't wish to cause trouble for the offender" (20 percent), "reluctance to get involved" (13 percent), and "police won't catch offender anyway" (7 percent).⁸ Waterbury's problem has been substan-

⁸ Research Department, Greater Waterbury Chamber of Commerce, What They're Thinking in Waterbury: A Citizen Survey, Waterbury, Connecticut, 1973, pp. 4-7.

tiated by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of

Justice in other areas of the country stating that reported crimes are merely a fraction of the total crime problem in any given community.⁹ The National Opinion Research Center indicated that in a survey of 10,000 households in 1967 the actual amount of crime in the United States is several times that reported in the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports (UCR). The Connecticut Planning Committee on Criminal

Administration stated,

"The amount of personal injury crime reported to the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) is almost twice the UCR rate and the amount of property crime more than twice as much as the UCR rate for individuals. Forcible rapes were more than 3-1/2 times the reported rate, burglaries three times, aggravated assaults and larcenies of \$50 and over more than double, and robbery 50 percent greater than the reported rate. Only vehicle theft was lower and then by a small amount."¹⁰

These findings indicate that reported street crimes are often only the visible part of the "crime iceberg".

a. Profile of Offenders

The only information available on the characteristics of Waterbury street crime offenders comes from the Waterbury Police Department's classification of offenses.

As can be seen from the following Table, males between the ages of 18 and 24 are responsible for the majority of all the street crimes in Waterbury. Furthermore, more whites than blacks are arrested for these offenses but the rate of arrest for blacks is higher than that for whites. According to the 1970 Census of Population, blacks in Waterbury above the age of 18 account for approximately 8 percent of the total population¹¹ but in 1973 they accounted for 56 percent of all the arrests for robberies, 51 percent of all the arrests for aggravated assaults, 39 percent of all the arrests for other assaults, 39 percent of all the arrests for burglary, 35 percent of all the arrests for larceny and 23 percent of all the

⁹President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, p. v, 1967.

¹⁰Street Crime, Order Maintenance and Police Service Functions, p. 25.

¹¹U.S. Bureau of Census, 1970 Census of Population and Housing, Census Tracts: Waterbury, Connecticut, SMSA (PHC(1)-227), p. 21.

In general, males are responsible for the majority of street crimes in Waterbury, but in the case of arrests for larceny, females accounted for 33 percent of all such offenses. Larceny (of which shoplifting is a subcategory) accounted for the greatest number of Waterbury's Street crime arrests with 1,868 cases reported in 1973. Furthermore, while those arrested for larceny were heavily drawn from the 18 to 24 year old age group, approximately 33 percent of all larceny arrests were made for offenders above the age of 30 and of those above 30 years of age approximately 30 percent were offenders over the age of 45.¹³ This points to the fact that shoplifting in particular and larceny in general are very serious problems encountered among all age groups, races and sexes.

b. Cost and Location of Crime in Waterbury

Just as certain individuals coming from economically deprived families have accounted for a disproportionate share of street crime, so has there been a disproportionate share of street crime originating in the low income areas of the city. The 1973 Comprehensive Criminal Justice report for the Central Naugatuck Valley Region stated,

"Persons interviewed for this report particularly various members of the Waterbury Police department, indicated that the incidence of street crime in Waterbury was highest in the inner city on the periphery of the North End, a predominantly lower income black area, and the South End, a predominantly lower income Puerto Rican area, and the only areas of Waterbury in which street crime does not seem to be a problem are the outlying residential areas."¹⁴

The impressions of those interviewed in 1972 were confirmed by the 1974 Annual Report of the Waterbury Police Department. As can be seen by Table I the census tracts with the highest number of crimes are in the downtown area and the North and South Ends. As can be seen from the table these are the low income areas of

¹²Waterbury Police Department, Annual Report, 1973, pp. 7-8.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Planning Agency, 1973 Comprehensive Criminal Justice Report for the Central Naugatuck Valley Region, October 1972, pp. 10-11.

Sex, Age and Race of Persons Arrested
For Offenses Associated With Street Crimes

Waterbury Police Department, 1973

Classification of Offenses	Total	Sex		Age												Race	
		Male	Female	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45 and over	White	Black
Robbery	57	55	2	4	5	3	5	2	3	4	24	2	0	3	2	25	32
Aggravated Assault	72	60	12	3	3	1	5	2	3	2	13	16	10	2	12	35	37
Other Assaults	240	205	35	9	11	12	12	12	13	19	48	30	24	26	24	150	90
Burglary	127	124	3	20	14	10	5	11	11	11	26	4	6	2	2	77	50
Larceny - Theft	333	221	112	29	15	24	30	17	21	31	58	45	15	21	57	215	118
Auto Theft	13	13	0	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	4	0	0	1	0	10	3

Source: Waterbury Police Department, 1973 Annual Report.

6-2-AX

Table I

Location of Street Crimes in Waterbury: 1974

Census Tract	Population	Percent Black	Median Income (families & individuals)	Number of Crimes*	Rate of Crime/ 100,000
3501	5679	22.1	\$4,518	951	16,745
3502	5455	41.2	7,023	283	5,188
3503	3380	28.4	7,483	268	7,929
3504	5366	32.8	6,740	404	7,529
3505	5224	2.2	7,039	318	6,087
3506	358	21.8	8,500	180	50,279
3507	497	4.4	7,383	262	52,716
3508	6784	5.3	8,298	299	4,407
3509	2242	4.0	11,552	65	2,899
3510	3546	1.6	10,856	99	2,791
3511	2350	35.6	9,885	530	22,553
3512	4468	36.7	6,198	200	4,476
3513	6028	0.7	8,341	126	2,090
3514	4737	2.5	9,404	173	3,652
3515	5213	0.2	10,444	172	3,299
3516	9228	0.4	10,297	249	2,698
3517	2970	2.3	7,025	123	4,141
3518	4453	1.5	10,586	132	2,964
3519	1144	1.7	5,944	33	2,884
3520	3858	0.7	12,898	136	3,525
3521	2900	0.8	10,969	101	3,482
3522	2530	8.3	8,651	83	3,280
3523	1819	2.3	9,089	121	6,652
3524	2382	26.3	7,744	59	2,476
3525	2130	2.1	11,082	130	6,103
3526	4143	1.3	10,502	87	2,100
3527	5293	0.2	10,418	254	4,799
3528	3856	1.7	11,750	165	4,279
Totals	108,033	10.1	8,761	6,003	5,556

Source: Waterbury Police Department 1974 and U.S. Bureau of Census, Census Tracts (PHC(1)-227) Waterbury Connecticut SMSA

*Does not include Auto Thefts from January to June 1974.

the city where most blacks and Spanish speaking people live. In the outlying residential areas (census tracts 3517-3526) where the number of street crimes was lowest in 1974, income of families and unrelated individuals was generally much higher than the inner city census tracts (3501-3507) during the year 1969.

However, the rate of street crimes per 100,000 population was highest in the downtown business district (census tract 3501), the industrial sections of town (3506 and 3507) and the outlying suburban shopping centers (3511).

While there has been no study done in Waterbury to determine whether the victims of street crime come from the same neighborhoods as the perpetrators, there is reason to believe that this supposition is true for certain types of crimes. It stands to reason that if blacks are responsible for a disproportionate share of all street crimes---and most street crimes occur in the North or South End of the city where most blacks and Puerto Ricans live---then it is quite likely that the victims of street crimes may also come from the same neighborhood as the perpetrators.

According to a 1966 study done of assaultive crimes in Chicago, there is strong evidence that the victim and the offender tend to be of the same race. As the table below indicates black males run the risk of being the victims of assaultive crimes nearly six times as often as a white male and black females nearly eight times as often as white females.

VICTIM-OFFENDER RELATIONSHIPS BY RACE AND SEX IN ASSAULTIVE CRIMES AGAINST THE PERSON (EXCEPT HOMICIDE)

	Offenses attributable to					All types of offenders
	White offenders		Negro offenders			
Victim rate for each 100,000: ¹	Male	Female	Male	Female		
White males	201	9	129	4	342	
White females	108	14	46	6	175	
Negro males	58	3	1,636	256	1,953	
Negro females	21	3	1,202	157	1,382	
Total population ¹	130	10	350	45	535	

¹The rates are based only on persons 14 years of age or older in each race-sex category. The "total population" category in addition excludes persons from racial groups other than Negro or white.

SOURCE: Special tabulations from Chicago Police Department, Data Systems Division. for period September 1965 to March 1966.

In effect this means that those who are hurt the most by the losses sustained through street crimes are often the economically disadvantaged citizens of Waterbury. The direct losses attributable to reported street crime in Waterbury appear to be quite high. According to the Connecticut Planning Committee on Criminal Administration(CPCCA), in 1970 there was an estimated loss of \$1,400,000 in Waterbury as a result of 3,326 street crimes.¹⁵ Using the CPCCA's method of estimating the loss from reported street crime, one finds that in 1973 the estimated loss due to street crime in Waterbury increased to \$1,531,029. As can be seen from the following table the primary loss was due to auto thefts and larceny. However, if one uses the street crime estimates developed by the National Opinion Research Center(NORC), the actual loss is even more startling, amounting to \$2,821,149 during 1973. If the NORC estimates are reliable for Waterbury, then there were over 4,800 unreported street crimes in 1973 resulting in an estimated loss of \$1,290,000.

Economics of Reported Street Crimes in Waterbury: 1973

	<u>Average Loss/Crime</u>	<u>Total Crimes</u>	<u>Approx. Total by Crime Type</u>
Robbery	\$ 261	174	\$ 45,414
Aggravated Assault	87	75	6,525
Burglary	337	1,280	431,360
Larceny	140	1,868	261,520
Auto Theft	1,095	718	786,210
		4,115	\$1,531,029

Economics of Estimated Street Crimes in Waterbury: 1973

	<u>Average Loss/Crime</u>	<u>Total Crimes</u>	<u>Approx. Total by Crime Type</u>
Robbery	\$ 261	261	\$ 68,121
Aggravated Assault	87	150	13,050
Burglary	337	4,044	1,362,828
Larceny	140	4,221	590,940
Auto Theft	1,095	718	786,210
		9,394	\$2,821,149

SOURCE: Waterbury Police Dept., 1973 and Uniform Crime Reports, FBI, 1973.

¹⁵Street Crime, Order Maintenance and Police Service Functions, pp. 23-24.

c. Racial Imbalance of the Waterbury Police Department

The fact that a large proportion of the street crime in Waterbury occurs in black and Puerto Rican sections of the city may be related to the racial composition of the Waterbury Police Department. For certain types of crime, some experts contend that the relative amount of crime associated with any given community or ethnic group may often have more of a relationship to the number of policemen patrolling a neighborhood and the ethnic composition of the police force than to any given community's crime problem. According to Clayton Hartjen,

"Insofar as the police have different expectations and opinions of various social groups, the rates of crime recorded for these categories of people could differ greatly independent of any differences in behavioral patterns characteristic of the groups."¹⁶

This problem may exist in Waterbury since its police department does not have a sufficient number of minority patrolmen in those areas of the city where most blacks and Puerto Ricans live, or in the city as a whole. At present, the police department has a total of 278 police officers of which 265 are white, 9 are black and only 4 are Puerto Rican.¹⁷ While blacks and Puerto Ricans represent almost 14 percent of the Waterbury population, they account for less than 5 percent of the members in the Waterbury Police Department. According to one person interviewed in the department, there has long been a dearth of black and Puerto Rican officers in the department.¹⁸ This person indicated that there had been a recruiting drive in 1971 in which a special effort was made to enlist more blacks and Puerto Ricans in the department. The Civil Service Commission conducted a massive advertising campaign throughout the State but were only able to attract a minimal number of black or Puerto Rican applicants.

There are several reasons for the underutilization of blacks and Puerto Ricans in

¹⁶ Clayton Hartjen, Crime and Criminalization, Praeger Publishers, New York, 1974, p. 170.

¹⁷ Interview with a Waterbury Police Officer, January 1975 and U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population and Housing, Census Tracts: Waterbury

¹⁸ Connecticut SISA, p.21.

Ibid.

the Waterbury Police Department. One reason that blacks have hesitated to join the Department is because they have felt that there was little or no chance of advancement into a supervisory position within the department. The fact that none of the 13 black or Puerto Rican members hold a supervisory position in the department has, in the opinion of one member interviewed, made many potential black candidates feel that "it might be a "dead end" job.¹⁹ A second reason for the low number of blacks and Puerto Ricans on the roster can be attributed to the emotional ambivalence of prospective black police members considering employment in a disproportionately white police department. An officer interviewed in the Waterbury Police Department stated that in many cases blacks feel they are turning their backs on their own race when they become police officers and are therefore reluctant to enlist. In the past this emotional distrust of police work accounted for the fact that Waterbury had an extremely hard time recruiting candidates for the job. Unfortunately, today while there has been an increase in the number of black candidates seriously interested in police work, these individuals have in many cases been ineligible because of their prior arrest records. This has left the Waterbury Police Department with few minority applicants to choose from to fill the patrolman's position.

The underutilization of blacks on the Waterbury police force is an area that must be given prompt attention. While the standards ought not to be lowered in order to obtain more black and Puerto Rican candidates, the Waterbury Police Department should do everything possible to encourage blacks and Puerto Ricans to enter police work. More blacks and Puerto Ricans within the department is an essential part of police community relations--visibly portraying to the black and Puerto Rican community that police relations with the black and Puerto Rican community reflect a concern for the lives of these individuals. Once steps have been taken to remedy the racial composition of the police department, one may very well

¹⁹Ibid.

find a decrease in the number of street crimes found in the black and Puerto Rican communities.

d. Detection and Apprehension of Offenders

In the past State and Regional studies of street crime have frequently cited effective law enforcement by the police as one method of preventing crime. The 1973 Criminal Justice Report prepared by the Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Planning Agency stated,

"It is well established that vigilant and aggressive police patrol prevents crime by eliminating the opportunity for perpetration of such crime and it stands to reason that a high rate of detection and apprehension of street crime offenders by the police might well serve as a deterrent to such crime."²⁰

Undoubtedly police patrols do affect local crime levels, but perhaps not as much as has been thought. According to a recent article in Connecticut Town and City,

"The basic crime fighting tactic of American police departments--regular street patrol by uniformed men in marked cars---does not appear to prevent crime, according to the preliminary findings of an elaborate year long experiment conducted in Kansas City, Mo.

"The key finding so far is that in matched areas of Kansas City with no regular patrol cars, one patrol car and five patrol cars, there were virtually no changes in reported crime levels during the one year test period. These areas were matched for similar patterns of reported crime, income and other characteristics."²¹

While police patrols may not be the best crime prevention instruments available to municipal police departments, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement indicates that street crimes cleared by arrest may have some deterrent value. As can be seen from the following Table, the Waterbury Police Department has an average clearance rate for offenses associated with street crime. In 1973 its clearance rates for assault, larceny and burglary were nearly the same as that experienced by the nation as a whole.²²

²⁰

1973 Comprehensive Criminal Justice Report for the Central Naugatuck Valley Region, pp. 19-20.

²¹ Connecticut Town & City, Criminal Justice Notes, July, 1974, p. 8.

²² F.B.I., Crime in the United States, Uniform Crime Reports 1973, (U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington D.C.), p. 32.

Offenses Associated with Street Crime Cleared
by Arrests --- Waterbury, 1973

Classification of Offense	Number of Actual Offenses	Total Offenses Cleared	% Cleared	% Nat'l.
Robbery	174	61	35	27
Assault	473	295	62	63
Burglary	1,280	182	14	18
Larceny, Theft	1,868	356	19	19
Auto Theft	718	89	12	16

Unfoundedly police patrols do affect local crime levels, but perhaps not as much. Furthermore as the Table below indicates the clearance rate for street crimes in Waterbury has improved over the last three years. Specifically auto thefts, robbery, larceny and burglary had higher clearance rates in 1973 than in 1971.

History of Clearance Rates in Waterbury: 1971-1973

Classification of Offenses	1971	1972	1973
Robbery	21	35	35
Aggravated Assault	75	60	62
Burglary	9	14	14
Larceny	9	22	19
Auto Theft	3	4	12

Source: Waterbury Police Department, 1974.

The increase in Waterbury's clearance rates is even more dramatic when one looks at the total crime index for the years 1971 through 1973. In 1971 there were 3,887 total crimes reported to the FBI while in 1973 there were 4,132 crimes reported. The increased level of crime indicates that Waterbury continues to have a growing crime problem but the increased clearance of crime indicates that

the police are performing better now than in previous years when crime was less of a problem. While increasing clearance rates do not make a city any safer to live in, they do indicate that those individuals who have been robbed or assaulted stand a better chance of reclaiming their lost possessions or of having their complaint adjudicated.

e. Larger Issues Affecting Crime in Waterbury

A broad and truly comprehensive analysis of crime must also consider the effect that the physical, social and economic structure of the city has upon different kinds of crime. The 1975 CPCCA Plan briefly alludes to the larger issues in its introductory remarks. It states,

"While the ability of the system to respond in an effective manner to varying caseloads and societal demands is a factor to be considered when discussing the reduction and prevention of criminal activity, one must look beyond the system itself when searching for ways in which to stem the alarming increases in crime presently being experienced in Connecticut and the rest of the Nation. Our educational institutions, religious organizations, the business community, and the citizenry itself must accept a large part of the burden in the fight against crime if present crime trends are to be effectively reversed.

"In addition even abbreviated discussions of this nature lead to many other questions concerning the causes of criminal activity. What are the relative effects, for example, of inflation, unemployment, geographic mobility, rising divorce rates, quality of education, and available private and public social services. While it is clear that Connecticut's official criminal justice system must address a large number of internal problems, it is also apparent that rising crime rates cannot be dealt with by this system alone."²³

During the last ten years while crime rates have been increasing in Waterbury, there has also been an increase in certain of its social and economic problems. In particular, housing, recreation, employment opportunities, the stability of urban and suburban communities and the quality of education have all been critical problems having some bearing on Waterbury's crime problem. These problems have disproportionately affected the urban poor, the blacks and the Puerto Ricans in Waterbury where crime rates have been found to be the most severe. While there are obviously many factors which lead to the commission of crime, it appears

²³Connecticut Planning Committee on Criminal Administration, Comprehensive Plan, 1975. p. A1-7.

that the Region's crime problems are more pronounced, and are localized in those areas where the Region's social and economic problems are the most severe. For this reason it is worth taking a close look at several social and economic indicators that have some bearing on Waterbury's crime problem.

According to the 1970 Census Data of the Waterbury SMSA, the unemployment rate for blacks was over twice as high as that of the total population, while the unemployment rate for Puerto Ricans was 4 times as high as that experienced by the total population.²⁴ Specifically the 1970 Census reported that while 3 percent of the total population was unemployed, 7 percent of the black population and 12 percent of the Spanish speaking population were unemployed.²⁵

Another measure of the economic barriers of blacks and Puerto Ricans is their educational attainments. The Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Planning Agency's Housing Element: 1974 states,

"In 1970, while half of the total population 25 years and over in the Waterbury SMSA had completed high school only 30 percent of the black population and 31 percent of the Spanish speaking population had graduated from High School. Not surprisingly the drop-out rate for both groups tends to be significantly higher in relation to the total SMSA population. Of those 16 to 21 years of age, 15 percent of the total group, 33 percent of the black group and 54 percent of the Spanish speaking group had dropped out of school."²⁶

The educational and employment problems of blacks in the Waterbury SMSA may have some bearing on the problem of Street Crime in Waterbury. As indicated earlier, under the section on "Profile of Offenders", while blacks comprised slightly more than 10 percent of the total population of Waterbury in 1970, blacks over 18 years of age accounted for 56 percent of the arrests for robbery, 51 percent of the arrests for aggravated assault, 35 percent of the arrests for other assaults, 35 percent of the arrests for larceny and theft, 39 percent for

²⁴ Census Tracts, p. 22.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Planning Agency, Housing Element: 1974, pp. 36-37.

burglary and 23 percent of the arrests for auto theft.²⁷

Since many of Waterbury's social and economic problems such as unemployment and lack of recreational opportunities are most pronounced among youth, it is not surprising that a large number of the youths involved in street crimes are blacks under the age of 18. These individuals are often the least able to obtain work and the most victimized by their own lower educational attainments. It is worth noting that in 1973 when blacks between the ages of 10 and 19 accounted for approximately 12 percent of the total population of that age group, they were responsible for 57 percent of the juvenile arrests for robbery, 75 percent of the juvenile arrests for aggravated assault, 42 percent of the juvenile arrests for burglary, 45 percent of the juvenile arrests for larceny and theft and 43 percent of the juvenile arrests for auto theft.²⁸

While juvenile blacks were responsible for a disproportionate share of all

juvenile offenses (approximately 28 percent of the total),²⁹ it is important to

note that black families generally received a rather small share of the Region's economic wealth. For instance, while 43 percent of all juvenile auto thefts were

committed by blacks, an equal percentage of black families in the Waterbury SMSA (43%) did not own an automobile.³⁰ Furthermore, while blacks accounted for a

disproportionate number of Waterbury's robberies and larcenies, they also accounted for a disproportionate number of the low income families in the Waterbury SMSA. In 1969 17 percent of all black families earned less than \$3,000. In

contrast only 6 percent of all the families in the SMSA earned less than \$3,000

in 1969.³¹

One proof of the marginal status of many low income black families in Waterbury is the fact that 58 percent of all black families with incomes below the poverty

²⁷Waterbury Police Department, Annual Report, 1973, pp. 7-9 and Census Tracts,

²⁸ p. 21.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Census Tracts, p. 21.

³² Ibid, pp. 16 & 22.

level were not receiving any public assistance income in 1969.³² Of all the black families in Waterbury below the poverty level 73 percent of them had a female head of household.³³ In addition, 89 percent of all unrelated black individuals with incomes under the poverty level were without public assistance income in 1969.³⁴ This lack of public assistance income for black families and unrelated individuals below the poverty level does not necessarily mean that these individuals will turn to robbery, theft or larceny to meet their needs, but it does indicate that these types of families will more likely be strapped to make ends meet than the rest of the population. Certainly in some instances this may turn some individuals to crime. Poor housing and overcrowded living conditions have also been viewed as a possible factor affecting certain types of crime. According to Hall and Calhoun,³⁵ increased population densities in urban neighborhoods and increased crowding tend to increase a person's level of stress which, in turn, may lead to aggressive behavior. In this regard it is worth noting that overcrowding occurred far more frequently with blacks and Puerto Ricans than with the total population.

The CNVRPA Housing Element: 1974 states, "In 1970, while only 8 percent of the total occupied dwelling units in the SMSA had one or more persons per room, an indication of overcrowding, 20 percent of the black occupied units and 24 percent of the Spanish speaking occupied units were overcrowded. Lower family incomes coupled with the fact that both groups tend to have larger families contributed to the high percentage of overcrowding."³⁶

Certainly overcrowded living quarters, along with deteriorating housing, poor street lighting and inadequate building security in the black and Puerto Rican communities has some bearing on the fact that blacks are responsible for (and the victims of) a disproportionate share of the assaults committed in Waterbury.

³²Ibid, p. 22.

³³Ibid.

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵E.T. Hall, The Hidden Dimension, Chapters III and IV.

³⁶Housing Element: 1974, p. 38.

3. NARCOTICS AND DRUG ABUSE IN WATERBURY

There is reason to believe that narcotics and drug abuse has increased in the Waterbury area since 1973. While there is little evidence on which to base this opinion the statistics of the Vice and Intelligence Division of the Waterbury Police Department and the statistics on drug arrests by the Waterbury Police Department both indicate an increase in the number of drug cases in the year 1974.

These statistics must be viewed with caution since arrests for drug offenses do not necessarily indicate the extent of the drug problem in the population as a whole. The arrest and adjudication process acts as a screening system filtering out a limited number of drug users from the total drug user population, and those individuals who have been arrested may not be a representative sample from year to year of the actual drug user population in the area.

However inaccurate or unrepresentative arrest statistics may be, they do provide some indication of the drug problem in Waterbury. As can be seen from the Table below, the number of arrests made by the Vice and Intelligence Division for drug offenses dropped steadily up until 1973 and then increased 36 percent between 1973 and 1974.

Arrests for Drug Offenses by the Vice and Intelligence Division of Waterbury Police Department: 1968-1974

	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Number of Arrests	77	191	278	244	180	110	150

Source: The Vice and Intelligence Division, Waterbury Police Department.

Similarly the Waterbury Police Department reported a 56% increase in drug arrests between 1973 and 1974. However, 96 percent of the increase in drug arrests between 1973 and 1974 was attributable to an increase in marijuana arrests. As can be seen from the following Table, the number of arrests for heroin, synthetic drugs, and barbituates has not greatly changed in the last year.

Drug Arrests in Waterbury

Percent

Change

	1973	1974	
Heroin	18	25	38.9%
Marijuana	127	242	90.6%
Synthetics	65	53	-18.6%
Barbiturates	3	10	233.3%

Source: Waterbury Police Department

In 1974, 70% of all drug arrests were for marijuana, 8.5% for heroin, 16.0% for synthetic drugs and 30% for barbiturates. While heroin and other hard drugs represented a fraction of the total drug arrests in 1974, they were a major problem in 1971. A comparison of the arrest statistics of the Vice and Intelligence Division for 1971 and 1973 indicates that while heroin arrests accounted for 46 percent of drug arrests in 1971, they accounted for only 21 percent of the drug arrests in 1973. Since 1971 arrests made by the Vice and Intelligence Division for offenses involving heroin have decreased from 117 to 24.

Part of the reason for the decline in the heroin problem in Waterbury has been due to the creation of the Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Crime Squad. A 1972 report prepared by the CPCCA states,

"When the Regional narcotics squad began operation in July of 1970, the major concentration of drug activity was in the Central City of Waterbury. As a result, most of the arrests were made there. The lieutenant in charge of the narcotic squad now feels that the drug sellers have moved out of Waterbury because of the intense pressure put on them by the narcotic squad. It is the opinion of the head of the narcotic squad that a person wishing to buy heroin must now travel to cities outside the Central Naugatuck Valley."³⁷

While the statistics of the Waterbury Police Department indicate that marijuana is now the most commonly used drug in Waterbury, the 1973 Criminal Justice report indicated that other drugs such as LSD, amphetamines, barbiturates, may still be serious problems. It states:

³⁷CPCCA, Drug and Alcohol Abuse in Connecticut, 1972, p. 29.

"While arrest statistics for 1971 indicate that the incidence of arrests involving such drugs (LSD, amphetamines, barbiturates) is relatively low as compared to the incidence of arrests involving heroin, this apparently reflects drug offense enforcement policies rather than the extent of the problem with respect to those drugs, that is to say enforcement efforts have been aimed primarily at heroin possession and sale.³⁸

Arrests Involving Any Offense by the Vice and Intelligence
Division of the Waterbury Police Department: 1971, 1973

<u>Arrests</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1973</u>
Heroin	117	24
Marijuana	78	58
Controlled Drugs	49	29
LSD	4	3
Hashish	5	11

Source: Vice and Intelligence Division, Waterbury Police Department,
1971, 1973

a. Profile of Drug Offenders

The 1973 Criminal Justice Report indicates that drug use is particularly widespread among teenagers in Waterbury and may be increasing. This view seems to be supported by the Waterbury Police Department's statistics on drug offenses.

The following police arrests for drug offenses for 1971-1974 indicate that as total arrests have increased, the number of juveniles arrested for drug offenses in Waterbury has also increased.³⁹ In 1971, 61 juveniles accounting for 27% of all drug offenses that year were arrested, while in 1974, 92 juveniles accounting for 28 percent of all drug offenses were arrested.

Arrests for Drug Offenses, Waterbury Police Department: 1971-1974

	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Over 18 years	160	172	144	240
Under 18 years	61	45	69	92
Total Arrests	221	217	213	332

³⁸Criminal Justice Report for the Central Naugatuck Valley Region, 1973, p. 49.
³⁹Waterbury Police Department, Annual Reports, 1971-1974.

The Waterbury Police Department indicates that most drug offenders are between the ages of 15 and 24 and within this age group those between the ages of 19 and 22 have accounted for the majority of the offenses. This is clearly seen in the Table on the following page which presents an age, sex and racial breakdown of those arrested for violations of drug laws in 1973 and 1974.

One should be careful not to interpret these statistics too narrowly since it would be a mistake to conclude from these arrest statistics that drug usage is primarily confined to the younger generation. Many adults are known to use marijuana but there is generally less police enforcement effort directed at these individuals.

The 1973 Criminal Justice Report indicated,

"heroin users are predominately males, 18 to 25 years old, both black and white, from a lower socio-economic level and have frequently dropped out of school....The LSD, amphetamine and barbiturate users are both male and female, predominately 18 to 25 years old, white, from a middle class background and tend to have more education than heroin users."⁴⁰

Marijuana users, on the other hand, tend to be more diverse a group, not being confined to one sex, race or socio-economic and educational background as are heroin and barbiturate users.

b. Drug Abuse and Street Crime

While drug offenses are generally victimless crimes, those who are addicted to drugs may commit street crimes in order to support their habit. There is no reliable data regarding the extent to which narcotic users commit street crimes in the Region but evidence from the Connecticut Adult Probation Department indicates that the most common methods of supporting a drug habit are stealing, shoplifting and housebreaking.⁴¹ Furthermore, street crimes committed by drug

⁴⁰ Criminal Justice Report for the Central Naugatuck Valley Region, 1973, p. 82.

⁴¹ Fourth Annual Report, Adult Probation Department, October 1, 1970, p. 10.

Sex, Age and Race of Persons Arrested for Violation of Drug Laws: 1973, 1974
Waterbury Police Department

	1973	Percent of Total (1973)	1974	Percent of Total (1974)	Percent Change 1973-1974
Total Persons Arrested	213		332		55.8%
Sex of Persons Arrested					
Male	185	87%	297	89%	
Female	28	13%	35	11%	
Age of Persons Arrested					
11-12	1)	0)	
13-14	12)	12)	
15	8)	18)	17%
16	19)	26)	40.0%
17	29)	36)	
18	26)	38)	22%
19	20)	30)	
20	20)	36)	35%
21	10)	23)	82.5%
22	13)	26)	
23	17)	22)	11%
24	12)	13)	20.6%
25-29	19)	33)	14%
30-34	7)	12)	73.8%
35-39	3)	5)	2%
40+	3)	2)	16.6%
Race of Persons Arrested					
White	170	80%	254	77%	
Black	43	20%	78	23%	

Source: Waterbury Police Department Annual Report 1973-1974.

addicts are estimated to be a significant portion of all street crime in the State. According to the 1969 Annual Report of the Connecticut State Police, their records indicate that close to 8 percent of the offenders in those crimes defined as street crime are known drug addicts.⁴² The Department of Corrections has indicated that the figure may be much higher. They indicate that 65% of those incarcerated for a crime against property or person were reported to be drug abusers.⁴³

It is worth noting that between 1971 and 1973 when the number of arrests for drug offenses began decreasing in Waterbury, there was a leveling off of reported larcenies and a decrease in burglaries in the city. However, in 1974 when drug arrests increased 55 percent over the previous year there was an 80 percent increase in the number of larcenies and a 40 percent increase in the number of burglaries reported over the previous year. This suggests that perhaps there is some connection between drug addiction and street crime in the Waterbury area.

c. Disposition of Offenders

There are no statistics available on the disposition of drug offenders in the 4th Circuit Court. The disposition of defendants convicted of drug offenses in the Superior Court, New Haven County at Waterbury for 1973-1974 was used instead.

The majority of those convicted for drug offenses by the Superior Court, New Haven County at Waterbury received suspended sentences.⁴⁴ However, in the case of the sale of narcotics or controlled drugs, the court tended to be more harsh in its punishment sending these offenders to Somers Correctional Institution or the New Haven Community Correctional Center. In addition, several of the offenders

⁴² Connecticut State Police Department, 1971 Annual Report and Circuit Court Statistical Reports, cited by the CPCCA in Drug and Alcohol Abuse In Connecticut, 1972, p. 12.

⁴³ Annual Report 1973, Connecticut Regional Crime Squads, Statewide Enforcement Coordinating Committee, p. 2.

⁴⁴ Court records of the Superior Court, New Haven County at Waterbury, 1973.

were sent to DAYTOP, a drug treatment center located in Waterbury, designed to rehabilitate drug abusers.

Sending drug addicts and users of marijuana to prison appears to be a serious problem in the opinion of state police and correctional center officials since drug offenders are being thrown in with hardened criminals and exposed to an environment which all too often has a negative effect upon their social outlook (see section on rehabilitation of offenders). Efforts need to be made to divert drug offenders (especially marijuana users) from the correctional centers and increase the treatment of these individuals in a non-criminal framework. This approach will not only ensure more effective drug treatment of the individuals involved, but will also reduce the negative effects created by incarceration with those who have committed more violent kinds of crime.

4. ORGANIZED POLICE DEPARTMENTS IN THE REGION

In addition to Waterbury, six of the Region's municipalities are serviced by organized police departments. These include the towns of Cheshire, Middlebury, Naugatuck, Thomaston, Watertown, and Wolcott. As can be seen from the Table below, in the remainder of the Region's municipalities, police service is provided by resident state troopers or a combination of state troopers and town constables.

<u>Police Departments in the Region: 1975</u>				Number of Constables and Supernumeraries In 1975
<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Established</u>	<u>Type of Police Service</u>	<u>Number of Full Time Police Officers in 1975</u>	
Beacon Falls	-	Resident State Trooper	1 Trooper	6
Bethlehem	-	Resident State Trooper	1 Trooper	6
Cheshire	1953	Police Department	26 Policemen	4
Middlebury	1973	Police Department	9 Policemen	8
Naugatuck	1847	Police Department	42 Policemen	0
Oxford	-	Resident State Troopers	2 Troopers	7
Prospect	-	Resident State Troopers	2 Troopers	6
Southbury	-	Resident State Troopers	2 Troopers	6
Thomaston	1953	Police Department	9 Policemen	11
Watertown	1951	Police Department	31 Policemen	7
Waterbury	1853	Police Department	279 Policemen	0
Wolcott	1957	Police Department	19 Policemen	16
Woodbury	-	Resident State Trooper	1 Trooper	7
			<u>424 Total</u>	<u>84</u>

Source: Interviews with Chiefs of Police, January, 1975, and interviews with Resident State Troopers, January, 1975.

Several of the municipalities that are presently being serviced by resident state troopers are seriously considering the idea of establishing organized police departments within their town or in cooperation with another town.⁴⁵ A report prepared by John H. Herder Associates in 1973 indicated that several of the Region's municipalities may be in need of improved police services in the near future. The study indicated,

"The optimum size of a community appears theoretically to be approximately 15,000 people. In this region the movement toward such a development occurs at a much lower population.

"Judging by the experience in the four (Middlebury, Oxford, Southbury, Woodbury) towns, the pressure to organize more comprehensive police services becomes quite strong when in face of a continued trend upward the population reaches a level of approximately 7,000 people."⁴⁶

According to the study, New England communities generally feel the need to establish a full time police department when their population is somewhere between 7,000 and 10,000 people. Based on this estimate Herder Associates estimated that Woodbury and Southbury will be establishing a full time police department in a few years while Oxford will require one around 1980. Beacon Falls and Bethlehem, both serviced by resident state troopers, will probably be adequately protected for the next twenty years without an organized police department. As can be seen from the Table below neither Bethlehem nor Beacon Falls will have populations reaching 7,000 in the next twenty years.

	1970 ²	1973 ¹	1980 ³	1990 ³	
Beacon Falls	3,546	3,800	4,000	4,300	
Bethlehem	1,923	2,000	2,200	2,500	
Oxford	4,480	5,000	5,600	6,700	
Prospect	6,543	6,600	7,700	8,900	
Southbury	7,852	8,600	10,600	12,700	
Woodbury	6,869	6,200	7,900	10,000	
¹ Connecticut Dept. of Health.					
² U.S. Census.					
³ RPA Projections.					

⁴⁵John H. Herder Associates, Six Town Police Study, July, 1973, p. 7.

⁴⁶Ibid.

However, the establishment of a full time police department is not always based upon growing populations and growing crime rates. There are many other factors that affect the need for police service within a municipality. For instance, Thomaston established its police department in 1953 when it had a population of 5,200 while Southbury with a population of 8,600 in 1973 has yet to establish a police department. Presently Thomaston with a population of 6,300 is served by 9 full time police officers and 11 part time officers (supernumeraries) while Southbury with 2,300 more people than Thomaston relies on the services of two resident state troopers and 6 constables.

a. Street Crime in the Suburban Municipalities

With the exception of Thomaston, all of the municipalities with an organized police department have witnessed an increase in the number of reported street crimes over the past four years. As can be seen from the Table below the number of total street crimes including rapes and homicides increased 29 percent between 1971 and 1974.

	Fiscal Year 1971-1972 <u>Total Street Crimes</u>	Calendar Year 1974 <u>Total Street Crimes</u>	Percent Change
Cheshire	443	503	13.0%
Middlebury	80	83	3.7%
Naugatuck	752	816	9.0%
Thomaston	102	75	-26.0%
Watertown	476	985	106.9%
Wolcott	329	358	9.0%
TOTAL	2,182	2,820	29.2%

Watertown in particular experienced the most dramatic growth in crime with a 107 percent increase in the number of Part I crimes reported between fiscal year 1971 and calendar year 1974. Most of the increase in street crime found in Watertown has been due to increases in breach of peace, burglaries and larceny. In particular, larcenies increased 71 percent, burglaries 55 percent and breach of peace nearly 400 percent between 1971 and 1974. (See table on next page.)

Street Crimes in Municipalities with Organized Police Departments: Fiscal Year 1971-1972

Type of Crime	Cheshire	Middlebury	Naugatuck	Thomaston	Watertown	Wolcott	Total
Criminal Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	0	1	1	0	7	0	9
Robbery	4	0	2	0	n.a.*	2	8
Breach of Peace	69	5	125	23	65	68	355
Burglary	107	29	149	38	143	122	588
Larceny	228	42	384	44	232	130	1,060
Auto Theft	35	4	91	0	36	7	173
TOTAL	443	81	752	105	483	329	2,193

Street Crimes in Municipalities with Organized Police Departments: Calendar Year 1974

Type of Crime	Cheshire	Middlebury	Naugatuck	Thomaston	Watertown	Wolcott	Total
Criminal Homicide	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Rape	3	0	0	0	4	0	7
Robbery	4	1	5	0	3	2	15
Breach of Peace	120	6	154	25	320	51	676
Burglary	110	16	162	16	221	111	636
Larceny	234	50	407	26	397	183	1,297
Auto Theft	31	10	88	8	40	11	188
TOTAL	503	83	816	75	985	358	2,820

*Not Available

Source: Police Departments of Each Municipality.

In fact the 400 percent increase in breach of peace incidents in Watertown accounted for slightly over 50 percent of the general increase in street crime witnessed between 1971 and 1974. However, it should be noted that there are some problems related to the use of breach of peace offenses as indicators of the level of street crime within a municipality. A large proportion of breach of peace offenses are reported by the police rather than by the general public with the result that this type of offense may reveal more about the activity of the police than the criminal activity of the general public. However, since many of the municipalities with organized police departments have not kept separate records for aggravated assaults, breach of peace was the only comparable offense which could be used as a reasonable proxy for this form of street crime.

Street crimes in the suburban municipalities are generally confined to breaking and entering, theft and breach of peace with very few reports ever being made of rapes, muggings (first, second or third degree assault), robbery or criminal homicide. In general nearly all of the crimes committed outside of Waterbury are crimes against property and not against persons. In the 12 municipalities surrounding Waterbury there was only one reported criminal homicide, 9 rapes and 17 robberies during the year 1974. In contrast, Waterbury reported 10 criminal homicides, 14 rapes and 115 robberies - accounting for more than 85 percent of all such street crimes in the Region during 1974.

The larger number of robberies, rapes and criminal homicides in Waterbury is in part due to a greater volume of commercial activities, a greater density of population, more street life and night life and more social problems (i.e. greater number of low income families, greater number of dilapidated housing units, greater number of individuals receiving welfare assistance, etc).

The most common street crimes in the 12 municipalities outside of Waterbury are larceny, burglary and breach of peace, in that order. Reported larceny (including auto theft) accounted for 50.8 percent, breach of peace 23.5 percent, burglary

24.8 percent, robbery 0.5 percent and rape and criminal homicide for less than 0.1 percent of all the street crimes in the 12 municipalities during 1974.

Another problem which appears to be quite severe in the suburban municipalities is vandalism. According to one person interviewed in the Watertown Police Department, recent increases in the juvenile population of Watertown have contributed to an ever increasing number of cases of vandalism.⁴⁷ This problem has been felt in all of the municipalities of the Region with Cheshire reporting a 72 percent increase, Naugatuck a 32 percent increase, Thomaston a 28 percent increase and Watertown an 88 percent increase between 1971 and 1974. More important, vandalism has increased at a faster rate than any of the Part I or Part II crimes reported within the Region. In each of the municipalities with an organized police department, vandalism increased at a faster rate than any other serious crime between 1971 and 1974.

b. Rate of Crime in the Region

The number of street crimes per 100,000 population is a commonly used indicator of a municipality's crime problem. As can be seen from Table II, Watertown with 5.1 street crimes per 100,000 has the highest crime rate in the Region (excluding Waterbury) and Southbury with .840 has the lowest street crime rate. However, to some extent the difference between Watertown's and Southbury's crime problem is related to the police services offered in these municipalities. As can be seen from the Table, in the six municipalities relying on resident state troopers the crime rate per 100,000 is less than one-third that witnessed in the state in 1973 and less than one-half that witnessed by municipalities with organized police departments (excluding Waterbury) in 1974.

There is reason to believe that the lower crime rate in the municipalities served by resident state troopers may not necessarily reflect a smaller crime problem.

It may be that some crimes are underreported to a greater degree than in other

⁴⁷Interview with a Watertown Police Officer, January, 1975.

Table II

Street Crime in the Region: 1974

Municipality	Homicide	Rape	Robbery	Breach of Peace	Burglary	Larceny	Auto Theft	Total	Crimes Per 100,000
Beacon Falls	0	0	0	18	22	25	n.a.**	65	1,670
Bethlehem	0	0	0	1	13	14	n.a.**	28	1,400
Cheshire	1	3	4	120	110	234	31	503	2,348
Middlebury	0	0	1	6	16	50	10	83	1,383
Naugatuck	0	0	5	154	162	407	88	816	3,256
Oxford	0	1	0	10	37	39	n.a.**	87	1,710
Prospect	0	0	0	18	47	32	n.a.**	97	1,470
Southbury	0	1	1	14	34	48	n.a.**	98	840
Thomaston	0	0	0	25	16	26	8	75	1,371
Watertown	0	4	3	320	221	397	40	985	5,130
Wolcott	0	0	2	51	111	183	11	358	2,712
Woodbury	0	0	1	10	54	35	n.a.**	100	1,540
Waterbury	10	14	115	4,002	1,803	3,437	842	10,223	8,983
Remainder of Region	1	9	17	747	843	1,490	188	3,295	2,605
Municipalities with Police Depts. (excl. Waterbury)	1	7	15	676	636	1,297	188	2,820	3,108
Municipalities with State Police only	0	2	2	71	207	193	n.a.**	475	1,331

**Not Available

Source: Police Departments and State Police.

areas of the Region because residents realize that they are provided with far less police service and protection or because police service in the suburban municipalities is more personal and may often lead to the trooper issuing a warning rather than an arrest. In addition, those municipalities with state troopers tend to spend a greater proportion of their time on non-crime related police matters such as motor vehicle arrests and traffic surveillance.⁴⁸

In comparing the rate of street crime within the Region to the National average rate of street crime in rural and suburban areas, one can determine which municipalities have inordinate crime problems. Based on statistics compiled by the FBI for 1973, one municipality has an above average rate of aggravated assaults (Beacon Falls). Two municipalities (Watertown and Waterbury) have an above average rate of burglaries, two municipalities (Watertown and Waterbury) have an above average rate of larceny and two municipalities (Naugatuck and Waterbury) have an above average rate of auto thefts.⁴⁹

c. Cost of Street Crime in the Region

The 1973 FBI report, Crime in the United States, indicated that substantial losses are incurred through street crime throughout the Nation.⁵⁰ According to the FBI auto thefts are the most costly crimes followed by burglaries, robbery and larceny.⁵¹ As can be seen from the Table below, the average auto theft loss was \$1095 while the average loss due to larceny amounted to \$140. While these figures

LOSS PER CRIME BY CRIME TYPE in 1973

	<u>Average Loss Per Crime in the Nation</u>	<u>Average Loss Per Crime in Cheshire</u>
Robbery	\$ 261	Not Available
Aggravated Assault	87	Not Available
Burglary	337	\$ 411
Larceny	140	94
Auto Theft	1,095	1,931

⁴⁸ Report of the Resident State Trooper for the municipality of Bethlehem as reported in the Bethlehem Annual Report of 1974.

⁴⁹ Clarence M. Kelley, Director of the FBI, Crime in the United States, 1973, pp. 15-30.

⁵⁰ Crime in the United States, 1973, pp. 15-31.

⁵¹ Ibid.

may give a good picture of street crime losses in the Nation as a whole, there may be some variation in the losses sustained in municipalities within the Central Naugatuck Valley Region.

In particular the Cheshire Police Department reports a higher street crime loss for burglaries and auto thefts than that witnessed in the Nation as a whole.⁵²

To some extent the difference in crime loss found in Cheshire and the Nation indicates that Cheshire is a more affluent municipality than the average municipality in the Nation. Using the Uniform Crime Report figures for average loss per crime, the Region's street crime loss can be estimated by multiplying the number of street crimes occurring by the average loss per crime. The Table below indicates the total loss by crime type.

TOTAL LOSS PER CRIME OUTSIDE OF WATERBURY: 1974

	Total Crimes	Approximate Total Loss By Crime
Robbery	17	\$ 4,437
Aggravated Assault	113*	8,787
Burglary	790	266,230
Larceny	1,458	203,300
Auto Thefts	196*	214,620
TOTAL	2,574	\$697,374

*Based on estimates for municipalities not separating auto thefts and aggravated assaults into separate classifications.

If the average loss per crime sustained in Cheshire is any indication of the economics of Regional Street Crime, the figures above may very well understate the crime loss problem witnessed in 1974. As can be seen from the Table, burglaries accounted for the largest dollar losses outside of Waterbury in 1974 followed by auto thefts and larceny.

These street crime losses were felt most severely in Watertown and Naugatuck with an estimated \$212,197 lost in Naugatuck and \$178,555 lost in Watertown. The

⁵² Annual report of Cheshire Police Dept., 1973.

Table below indicates the street crime losses for all of the municipalities in the Region. Watertown experienced the highest per capita loss due to street crime with \$9.30 lost per capita and Southbury had the lowest with a \$1.79 per capita loss.

THE ECONOMICS OF STREET CRIME IN THE REGION

Municipality	Estimated Loss on Reported Street Crime	Per Capita on Reported Street Crime
Waterbury	\$2,052,541	\$18.04
Remainder of Region	721,021	5.69
Beacon Falls	13,607	3.48
Bethlehem	7,296	3.64
Cheshire	104,906	4.94
Middlebury	23,690	3.95
Naugatuck	212,197	8.49
Oxford	18,799	3.68
Prospect	21,816	3.30
Southbury	20,872	1.79
Thomaston	17,792	2.87
Watertown	178,555	9.30
Wolcott	75,855	5.75
Woodbury	25,636	3.94

Source: Annual Reports of Police Departments, State Police Headquarters in Hartford, Conn., Crime in the United States, Clarence M. Kelley, Director of the FBI, 1973, pp. 15-31 and Task Force Report: Crime and Its Impact - An Assessment, The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967, p. 45.

d. Police Service and Functions

The functions and services provided by the police vary considerably from the central city of Waterbury to the surrounding suburban municipalities. In Waterbury, police surveillance and protection is offered by foot patrolmen as well as through the use of patrol cars whereas in the suburbs patrol cars are almost the

only efficient surveillance method. Waterbury's Police Department by virtue of its size offers more services to the city than any of the other suburban municipalities. The Waterbury Police Department is composed of a multitude of bureaus and divisions geared to cope with specialized areas of police service. The Department is composed of a records division, youth bureau, vice and intelligence unit, street crime and support unit, office of legal advisor, detective bureau, training division, police community relations division, 3 patrol shifts, Criminal Investigation bureau, inspectional services division, crime prevention bureau, the research and development division, the Uniform bureau, traffic division, tactical operations division, the paint and sign division, and the dog warden. While these services are necessary for the functioning of a large police department like Waterbury's, in a small municipality such as Middlebury many of these extra bureaus or divisions become the responsibility of the police chief or his assistants. The differences in size and organization between Waterbury's Police Department and those of the surrounding municipalities reflect the money available for police protection. Waterbury's police budget of \$3,272,095 accounted for 64 percent of all the monies spent on police protection in the Region during fiscal year 1973.⁵³ In the smaller municipalities with resident state police, appropriations for police protection are minimal ranging from \$11,600 in Bethlehem to \$59,950 in Woodbury in fiscal year 1973. A comparison of the per capita costs of police protection for municipalities with resident state police, municipalities with police departments (excluding Waterbury) and Waterbury's Police Department indicates that state police municipalities spent an average of \$5.66 per capita, Waterbury spent \$29.26 per capita while the other organized police departments spent \$18.84 per capita. (See the Table on the following page.)

While the smaller appropriations for police protection in the suburban municipalities have limited the police services and protection provided, in most cases local residents are satisfied with the present level and cost of police service.

In contrast, many Police Chiefs in the Region have indicated a need for increased

⁵³Annual Reports of each municipality and local police departments in the municipalities of Middlebury and Watertown.

appropriations for police service. This has been particularly true of Cheshire, Naugatuck and Watertown where street crimes have been increasing at a faster rate than in the other suburban municipalities.

Appropriations for Police Protection in the Region: 1973

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Appropriations</u>	<u>Cost per Capita</u>
Beacon Falls	\$ 22,527	\$ 5.93
Bethlehem	11,600	5.80
Cheshire	269,817	13.16
Middlebury	155,971	26.44
Naugatuck	517,305	20.64
Oxford	20,000	4.00
Prospect	35,140	5.32
Southbury	33,065	3.84
Thomaston	113,300	17.98
Watertown	404,330	21.06
Wolcott	217,696	16.61
Woodbury	59,950	9.66
Waterbury	\$3,272,095	\$29.26
Remainder of Region	1,860,701	15.34
Municipalities with Resident State Police	182,282	5.66
Municipalities with Police Depts. (excl. Waterbury)	1,678,419	18.84

Source: Annual Reports of each municipality and Connecticut State Department of Health, Weekly Health Bulletin Vol. 55, No. 40 (October 1, 1973).

Certainly limited budgets have constrained the services provided by many municipal police departments. All of the organized police departments in the Region feel they are without sufficient funds to maintain enough police officers as full time patrolmen, with the result that sworn officers may often be doing clerical and

dispatching duties in addition to their law enforcement chores. The limited budgets of these municipalities has meant that some police officers have been required to perform a variety of noncrime-related tasks which might be better handled by civilian personnel.

In addition, limited budgets cut down on the crime detection capabilities of a police department. Since the Region's police departments cannot afford to spend money for such specialized services as records, youth or community relations bureaus, police officers are not able to rely on expert support from within their department. To some extent State officials in the CPCCA have felt that a Regional or multitown approach to the provision of many special police services could reduce police costs and increase the efficient utilization of police officers. At present, Waterbury along with Watertown, Naugatuck, Thomaston, Wolcott and Middlebury is participating in a Regional Identification Center located in Waterbury. The Center is designed to provide police with more professional testimony in court, thereby improving police clearance rates. In addition, Edward Flaherty, the Regional Criminal Justice Planner, had indicated that Waterbury along with some of the other municipalities, is planning to obtain a polygraph machine to be located in Waterbury. Other multitown efforts dealing with records keeping, vice and intelligence, crime prevention and research and development could also lead to reduced costs and greater efficiencies in all of the Region's police departments.

e. Manpower and Training

Since 1973 when the CNVRPA ranked manpower as the top priority within the Region, almost all of the organized police departments outside of Waterbury have increased the number of police officers in their departments.⁵⁴ In part, this reflects a growth in the population of the suburban municipalities over the last 5 years as well as an increase in actual crime problems. The Table below indicates the manpower available in 1972 and in 1974 for the 6 municipalities with police departments.

	Approximate Total Force (all shifts) Police Officers		Percent Reduction When 4 Policemen have a Non- Enforcement Task
	1972	1974	
Naugatuck	40	42	10
Watertown	26	31	13
Cheshire	20	26	15
Wolcott	8	19	21
Middlebury	9	9	44
Thomaston	6	9	44
TOTAL	109	136	18 percent

⁵⁴1973 Criminal Justice Report, pp. 79-80.

Despite increases in the number of sworn police officers in the six municipalities nearly all of the police chiefs interviewed indicated that manpower was still as much a problem as ever. In January of 1975 the Watertown police chief said he could easily use another 10 men while the Cheshire Police Department indicates that its department was still expanding in size to keep pace with the rising number of people and industries in town.⁵⁵ The Naugatuck Police Chief took exception to the ranking of the Region's police problems. Frank Mariano, the Naugatuck Police Chief stated that his department presently has sufficient manpower to cope with crime problems in its jurisdiction. However, he added that the cost of training police officers has been a problem since the department must pay for the police officer's training as well as for the cost of the replacement for the police officer while he is in training.⁵⁶

According to the CNVRPA report, additional manpower may also relieve some of the other problems facing the Region's police departments. It states,

"Only after the police officer is relieved of non-enforcement duties will there be any appreciable effect in the other pressing problems in these towns, mainly street crime, narcotics and drug abuse, and Juvenile Delinquency."⁵⁷

As can be seen from the Table on the previous page, whenever four police officers are performing a non-enforcement task there is a sharp reduction in the number of police available to fight crime. According to one source interviewed by the CNVRPA, departments should

"Keep policemen out on the road doing the job that they are trained to do...and don't have them acting as taxi drivers, secretaries and record clerks."⁵⁸

Certainly additional manpower will curtail some of the non-enforcement duties of police officers but equally important to police effectiveness, the Region's police departments must also improve the educational and training level of their present

⁵⁵Interview with an officer in the Cheshire Police Department, December 1974.

⁵⁶Interview with Frank Mariano, December 1974.

⁵⁷1973 Criminal Justice Report, p. 81

⁵⁸Ibid, p. 80.

staff. The 1973 CNVRPA report emphasized that the majority of those persons interviewed in the six police departments indicated that more highly educated and better trained police officers was a high priority item.⁵⁹ It is only since 1969 that veteran police officers in the Region can avail themselves of a formal in-service training course to refresh themselves of the latest law enforcement ideas and practices. Prior to that time there was no formal in-service training offered to police officers within the Region. Indeed, according to Sec. 7-294E of the General Statutes of Connecticut, it was only as of October 1, 1966 that police recruits in the State of Connecticut were required to take a basic training course before receiving their appointment with a municipal department.⁶⁰ As a result of the standardized basic training which began in 1966, many police departments have some police officers who never received any mandatory training prior to their appointment. In response to this problem the LEAA funded a program in 1969 to establish an in-service training program for all the Region's veteran police officers. At present this program is run through the Waterbury Police Training Center and is sponsored by the Western Connecticut Criminal Justice Supervisory Board in Middlebury.

The need for improved training is more desperate in the smaller police departments because a police officer in a smaller municipality is required to be a "jack of all trades" whereas in a large department an officer is usually afforded a greater opportunity to specialize.⁶¹ Since the suburban police officers are required to perform a variety of tasks in a competent fashion, even when they have had little experience in each sphere, it becomes clear that periodic in-service training courses must be part of the basic work routine of all the Region's police officers.

f. Communication and Information Systems in the Suburban Municipalities

One of the most difficult problems when it comes to evaluating the crime problems

⁵⁹Ibid, p. 81.

⁶⁰General Statutes of Connecticut, Section 7-294E Revised to 1972, As Amended.

⁶¹1973 Criminal Justice Report, p. 81.

of the Region or of the six individual municipalities with organized police departments is the lack of uniform crime reporting. Each of the six police departments in the Region (outside of Waterbury) has its own way of reporting crime statistics and often the statistics are made more confusing because some departments have altered their definitions of specific crimes from one year to the next (e.g. breach of peace or assaults). Lacking uniform crime reporting standards in all six of the municipalities with police departments, it becomes difficult to assess accurately the extent of certain types of crime problems or the needs of local police. The Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Planning Agency's Criminal Justice Report indicated that in 1973 none of the six municipalities had computerized their records system and that some of the departments are without a central records bureau.⁶² These problems not only make it difficult to assess the regional crime problems but they might also make it difficult for adjoining municipalities to share records or information with other police departments that may be pursuing the same suspect.

Despite the fact that communications systems was ranked last on the list of regional criminal justice priorities in 1973, many of the Region's police chiefs consider it to be the most important need within their department.⁶³ In particular Naugatuck's Police Chief said that his department is in dire need of hand radios for all of his sworn officers.⁶⁴ He indicated that a good communication system was a prerequisite to any police department's efforts at reducing crime within its municipality. In 1973 the CNVRPA Criminal Justice Report indicated that with the exception of Waterbury's Police Department, all of the Region's police were in need of complete radio dispatch centers and portable radios.⁶⁵

Without a radio equipped police department one police chief stated there was no way of knowing where his police were located nor of how to efficiently dispatch

⁶²Ibid, p. 92.

⁶³Ibid, p. 92.

⁶⁴Interview with Frank Mariano, Naugatuck Police Chief, December 1974.

⁶⁵1973 Criminal Justice Report, p. 92.

them to the scene of a crime. The need for improved communications systems must be met before any efforts are made to achieve the long range goals of computerizing and sharing the Region's information systems.

At a Regional level there now exists a mutual assistance compact which allows all of the Police Departments in the Region to come to each others aid.⁶⁶ In addition the Regional Criminal Justice Planner is working on a program to establish a regional identification center located in Waterbury in order to (1) reduce the costs of providing this service on a town by town basis and (2) increase the ease with which cooperative efforts can be made between municipalities in the apprehension of criminal suspects.

5. THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM

As of January 1, 1975 the Court of Common Pleas and the State Circuit Court were merged into one court to handle all motor vehicle and criminal cases in the state.⁶⁷ As it stands now the Court of Common Pleas can handle all civil actions up to \$15,000 and criminal cases involving penalties up to a \$1,000 fine and one year imprisonment.⁶⁸ All cases involving civil action in excess of \$15,000 or criminal cases with penalties over \$1,000 are handled by the Superior Court.⁶⁹

The Superior Courts of Connecticut are located in eight counties of the state while the Circuit Courts are located in 18 different Circuits throughout the state. The Central Naugatuck Valley Region, falling within two counties, is served by the Superior Court of New Haven County at Waterbury and the Litchfield Superior Court. In addition, the 4th Circuit Court is located in Waterbury as well. With the reorganization of the Circuit Court system on January 1, 1975, the 4th Circuit Court has changed its name to the Geographical Area 4 Court of Common Pleas and has expanded its jurisdiction within the Central Naugatuck Valley Region. Previous to January 1, 1975 the 4th Circuit Court took all cases from

⁶⁶Interview with Edward Flaherty, Criminal Justice Planner for Western Connecticut, November 1974.

⁶⁷1975 Comprehensive Plan, pp. A1-90-95.

⁶⁸Ibid.

⁶⁹Ibid.

the municipalities of Middlebury, Naugatuck, Prospect, Waterbury, Watertown, Wolcott and Woodbury with the remainder of the Region's municipalities falling into four other Circuits. Since the reorganization, Plymouth, Thomaston, Cheshire and Bethlehem have been added to the jurisdiction of the Geographical Area 4 Court and the three other municipalities of the Region, Southbury, Oxford, and Beacon Falls have been placed under the jurisdiction of the Geographical Area 5 Court.⁷⁰ If we use the 1973 Circuit Court Statistical Report to estimate the potential increase in caseloads that will occur with the reorganization of the court system in Waterbury, it is expected that the number of cases handled by the new court should increase by over 18 percent. On the basis of 1973 circuit court caseloads, the addition of the four towns to the Geographical Area 4 Court may increase the number of cases handled from 11,835 to 14,036. (See Table III). Because of the added delays in processing cases and the disruption of old relationships, many police departments would like to return to the old circuit jurisdiction. This may occur if the State legislature passes an active bill seeking to return the court boundaries to their original jurisdiction. To some extent this expanded jurisdiction and expanded caseload will be offset by the larger court facilities now available in Waterbury. As of September of 1974, the 4th Circuit Court and the Superior Court of New Haven County at Waterbury have moved to two new buildings with more room than where they were formerly located. The new court building provides for an additional court room which should help deal with any increase in the court's caseloads.

a. Processing of Cases

There are few statistics available by which to evaluate the efficiency of the 4th Circuit Court or the Superior Court of New Haven County at Waterbury. However, according to the 1973 CNVR Criminal Justice Report, the efficient and fair processing of defendants was a serious problem in previous years.⁷¹ The report indicated that lack of manpower and inadequate facilities were the primary problems at that time. While the problem of inadequate facilities has been taken care of since the publication of the 1973 CNVRPA report, manpower is still a concern. Manpower is

⁷⁰Ibid.

⁷¹1973 Criminal Justice Report, p. 70.

Table III

Offenses Disposed of by the Circuit Court for
Municipalities in the CNVR: 1972 - 1973

Municipality	1972			1973			Criminal Offenses As % of Total
	Total	Motor	Criminal	Total	Motor	Criminal	
Beacon Falls	338	290	48	261	227	34	13.0%
Bethlehem	51	32	19	49	33	16	32.6%
Cheshire	778	486	292	1,299	900	399	30.7%
Middlebury	282	227	55	401	330	71	17.7%
Naugatuck	1,244	915	329	1,263	951	312	24.7%
Oxford	138	59	79	139	64	75	53.9%
Prospect	213	150	63	349	288	61	17.4%
Southbury	257	170	87	292	186	106	36.3%
Thomaston	496	356	140	482	342	140	29.0%
Waterbury	8,111	3,900	4,211	7,979	3,948	4,031	50.5%
Watertown	1,056	739	317	1,075	820	255	31.0%
Wolcott	373	262	111	427	290	137	32.0%
Woodbury	385	304	81	437	383	54	12.3%
Total	13,722	7,890	5,832	14,453	8,762	5,691	39.3%
Plymouth	-	-	-	371	161	205	55.3%
Statewide Total	-	-	-	270,806	176,034	94,772	34.9%

Source: State of Connecticut Circuit Court Statistical Report, 1972 - 1973.

Sources: Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas, 1972

Interview with Mr. Butler, Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas, January 1972.
1972 Comprehensive Plan, p. A1-90-92.
Interview with Mr. Butler, Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas, January 1972.
Ibid.

not only a vexing problem for the Waterbury court system but for the state courts in general. According to the Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas in Waterbury, there are only 3 judges, 3 prosecutors, 1 part-time assistant prosecutor and 2 public defenders to handle all of the cases before the present Court of Common Pleas.⁷² The State Comprehensive Plan has stressed the need for more manpower and this view is also held by the Clerks of the Superior and the Circuit Courts in Waterbury. The 1975 State Plan indicates that increases in the number of prosecutors must be coordinated with any increases in the number of public defenders in order to insure that one section of the court system is not benefited at the expense of another.⁷³

The Clerk of the Waterbury Court of Common Pleas indicated that there was a strong need for more judges and more public defenders in the Waterbury courts.⁷⁴ He indicated that as a result of the recent restructuring of the court system, one of the judges had been relocated to another court within the state.⁷⁵ The Table below indicates that between 1972 and 1975, there has not been much improvement in the number of personnel available to process criminal and motor vehicle cases handled by the Court of Common Pleas.

Personnel Available to Court of Common Pleas
(Formerly 4th Circuit Court)

	1972	1975
Public Defenders	1	2
Part-Time Defenders	1/2	-
Judges	2	3
Full-Time Prosecutors	2	3
Part-Time Prosecutors	1/2	1/2
TOTAL	6	8 1/2

Source: Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas, 1975

⁷²Interview with Mr. Butler, Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas, January 1975.

⁷³1975 Comprehensive Plan, p. A1-90-95.

⁷⁴Interview with Mr. Butler, Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas, January 1975.

⁷⁵Ibid.

Since judges are a most essential part of the court system the great manpower needs are in this area. One direct result of insufficient manpower appears to be that caseloads in the court have become overwhelming with considerable amount of backlog from previous years. According to one state police official, some cases heard in Circuit Courts within the state take from one to two years before they are actually heard.⁷⁶ This problem is evident from the statistics, presented in the Table below, prepared by the 4th Circuit Court for 1973-1974. A comparison of the cases pending at the beginning of fiscal year 1973 shows that the 4th Circuit Court had 1,574 criminal and 797 motor vehicle cases pending while the 18 state Circuit Courts had 15,885 criminal cases and 12,424 motor vehicle cases pending at the beginning of the same year. It is worth noting that while the 4th Circuit Court covered a jurisdiction with 6 percent of the state's population, it had nearly 10 percent of the total pending state criminal cases at the beginning of fiscal year 1973 and 13 percent of the total pending state criminal cases at the beginning of fiscal year 1974.

4th Circuit Court (Criminal Cases)

Year Beginning	Cases Pending at Beginning		Cases Added		Total Cases Disposed Of		Cases at End	
	Crim.	M.V.	Crim.	M.V.	Crim.	M.V.	Crim.	M.V.
7/1/72	---	---	---	---	---	---	1,574	797
7/1/73	1,574	797	5,032	6,237	4,325	5,823	2,465	1,521

All Circuit Courts (Criminal Cases)

7/1/72	---	---	---	---	---	---	15,885	12,424
7/1/73	15,885	12,424	89,662	169,222	87,245	165,520	18,302	16,126

Source: Judicial Department and the 4th Circuit Court at Waterbury, Conn.

This pressure of heavy caseloads appears to affect the manner in which criminal and motor vehicle cases are processed. According to the 1973 CNVR Criminal Justice Report,

⁷⁶ Interview with Officer in Research and Development Division of The Connecticut State Police, January 1975.

"Some members of the Waterbury Police Department felt that excessive plea bargaining took place in the 4th Circuit Court partly because of the pressure of heavy caseloads. As a consequence defendants were allowed to plead to a lesser charge and cases were nolle which should not have been nolle." 77

As the Table below indicates, only 62 of the 4,325 criminal cases disposed of in the 4th Circuit Court were ever taken to trial. This procedure has been necessary in recent years in order to allow the courts to keep pace with the ever increasing number of cases brought before it every year. Certainly, if all of the 4,325 criminal cases disposed of by the 4th Circuit Court in fiscal year 1973 were tried by jury, the entire court system would be brought to a standstill.

4th Circuit Court (Non-Motor Vehicle Criminal Trials)

July 1, 1973 - July 1, 1974

Year Beginning	Total Criminal Cases Disposed Of	Cases Tried		Convicted		Represented By Public Defender		Bound Over to Superior Court
		Jury	Non-Jury	Jury	Non-Jury	Jury	Non-Jury	
7/1/73	4,325	20	42	6	21	1	12	11

All Circuit Courts

July 1, 1973 - July 1, 1974

7/1/73	87,245	288	1,361	178	958	392	375
<u>4th Circuit Court (Non-Motor Vehicle Criminal Trials)</u>							

July 1, 1973 - July 1, 1974

Year <u>Beginning</u>	<u>Discharged</u>	
7/1/73	6	
<u>All Circuit Courts</u>		

July 1, 1973 - July 1, 1974

7/1/73	<u>Discharged</u>
--------	-------------------

Source: Judicial Department and the 4th Circuit Court at Waterbury, Conn.

While there have been few criminal trials in the 4th Circuit Court, the low number of criminal cases brought to trial is not out of line with the activity of all the other State Circuit Courts. In fiscal year 1973, approximately 1.8 percent of all criminal cases disposed of in the Waterbury Circuit Court went to trial and in the state as a whole, approximately 1.4 percent of all criminal cases disposed of went to trial.⁷⁸ These statistics imply that plea bargaining is as pervasive throughout all 18 circuit courts as it is in the 4th Circuit Court in Waterbury.

b. Disposition of Those Arrested for Street Crimes

Based on evidence from the Cheshire and Naugatuck Police Departments, 64 percent of all street crime offenders were found guilty of the offense charged during calendar year 1974. Another 17 percent were found guilty of a lesser charge, 10 percent were referred to the juvenile court, none were acquitted and 9 percent of those arrested had their case pending at the end of the year. These statistics appear to reflect the general procedural outcome of all street crime cases in the Region, since there is a little variation in the disposition of cases from one municipality to another. As an example in Cheshire, 58 percent of all street crime offenders were found guilty of the offense charged, while in Naugatuck 70 percent of all persons arrested for street crimes were guilty of the offense charged. Neither department reported any acquittals in cases of street crimes, although there were several cases pending at the end of the year in Cheshire. While to some extent the minor differences in the procedural outcome of cases may be related to the strength of the case presented by the police department, in most instances it is the courts which have been responsible for reducing charges against offenders.

c. Disposition of Those Convicted in the Region

Although there is no information available on the number of offenders incarcerated

⁷⁸ 1975 Comprehensive Plan, pp. A1-90-95.

by the 4th Circuit Court, there is information on the number of offenders incarcerated by all 18 circuit courts and by the Superior Court, New Haven County at Waterbury. As can be seen from the Table below, approximately 85.2% of all those convicted in the state circuit courts receive a fine. In contrast 48.4 percent of all those convicted in the Superior Court, New Haven County at Waterbury and 62.4 percent of all those convicted in all eight Superior Courts were sent to a correctional facility.

Disposition of Those Convicted in the State Superior and Circuit Courts: 1973-74

<u>Disposition</u>	<u>Superior Region</u>		<u>Superior State</u>		<u>All Circuit Courts</u>
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>	
State Prison	47	36.1)	691	34.1)	
Reformatory	7	5.4)	196	9.7)	2.9%*
Comm. Corr. Ctr.	9	6.9)	378	18.6)	
Susp. Sentence	59	45.4	731	36.0	11.5%
Fines Only	4	3.1	28	1.4	85.2%
Other Sentence	0	0.0	0	0.0	Unknown
Mental Health Trt.	4	3.1	4	0.2	Unknown
TOTAL	130	100.0%	2,028	100.0%	100.0%

*This is the total of all those disposed of in State prisons, reformatories and correctional centers.

Source: 1975 Comprehensive Plan, and Superior Court of New Haven at Waterbury.

Since the Superior Court only handles cases involving serious crimes, it is not surprising that it has a higher number of cases disposed of through incarceration than does the circuit court system.

6. THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS

It has become increasingly clear that the criminal justice system has all too often served as a school for making small-time offenders more professional criminals. A report by the State Department of Corrections indicated the bankruptcy of present methods of reforming the criminal. It said,

"It is a fact that nearly all our offenders will eventually be released to the community. It is also a fact that at the present time, many of these individuals will return to prison. It is also probably true that present correctional practices contribute to this failure rate and that

many individuals learn how and are conditioned to commit more serious crimes as a result of their prison experience."⁷⁹

The extent of the problem is worse than might be expected. According to the 1975 Comprehensive Plan for Criminal Justice, an estimated 75% of those incarcerated in correctional institutions (i.e., sentenced to a term of one year or more) will be back in correctional institutions at some point in the future.⁸⁰

a. Correctional Institutions

The State Department of Corrections has 5 correctional institutions and 6 community correctional centers.⁸¹ The community correctional centers are for male offenders awaiting disposition of their cases and those serving short-terms of incarceration. Correctional institutions are for long-term sentences with two institutions for males (Somers, Enfield), two for youthful male offenders (Cheshire, Portland), and one for females (Niantic).⁸² Of those committed by the Superior Court of New Haven County at Waterbury to be incarcerated during 1973-74 fiscal year, the majority of the total were sent to Somers (38.8%).⁸³ However, the Cheshire Correctional Institution, the Niantic Correctional Institution for Women and the New Haven Community Correctional Center were also used to incarcerate offenders processed by the Superior Court of New Haven County at Waterbury. (See Table below)

Disposition of Those Convicted in The Superior Court of New Haven County at Waterbury 1973-74

Somers	47
New Haven	6
Niantic	3
Cheshire	7
Suspended Sentence	59
Fines Only	4
Mental Health	4
Treatment	4
Total	130

⁷⁹John R. Manson, Commissioner, General Outline of the Proposed Correctional Master Plan and Female Pilot Program for Connecticut Department of Correction, July 1973, p. 2.

⁸⁰1975 Comprehensive Plan, p. A1-1.

⁸¹Ibid, pp. A1-95-105.

⁸²Ibid.

⁸³Court Records of the Superior Court of New Haven County at Waterbury, 1973-1974.

b. Recidivism in Waterbury

Though little data on the number of recidivists exists for the Region, the statistics on the recidivist rate for juvenile offenders referred to the Waterbury Juvenile Court suggest that the figure is high. In 1971 nearly 62 percent of the juveniles referred to the Juvenile Court in Waterbury had prior referrals. This indicates that rehabilitation programs in this Region may need improvement.

According to the 1973 Criminal Justice Report for the Central Naugatuck Valley Region,

"The Juvenile Court System in Waterbury appears, in part, to be hampered in its treatment and rehabilitative efforts by a lack of adequate dispositional alternatives. Essentially, four alternatives are presently utilized: (1) release; (2) probation supervision; (3) institutionalization; and (4) referral to institutions, agencies or individuals outside the juvenile justice system. According to some of the individuals interviewed, the main problem is that there are very few facilities available for the juvenile who does not need institutionalization but whose home environment is such that it is thought advisable to remove him from it and/or who is in need of more supervision than the juvenile probation can provide."⁸⁴ However, a recent program sponsored by the Waterbury YMCA has been much more successful in providing viable alternatives for youthful offenders. The YMCA runs a mini-bike program for approximately 24 adolescents between the ages of 11 and 15 who have been referred from the Waterbury Juvenile Court. At present, there are only two such programs in the State of Connecticut, but it appears that other cities may be initiating similar programs soon. While the program only caters to 24 adolescents, it has been outstandingly successful in improving the attitude and behavior of these individuals. In 1974, only 4% of the participants were recidivists. The YMCA is also initiating a youth service program designed to provide better coordination of services to youthful offenders. The program is funded by the LEAA and is to begin in mid 1975.

c. Manpower

Another equally important problem with the correctional system is the lack of adequate training for correctional personnel. The Connecticut Planning Committee on Criminal Administration indicated in their 1972 study, The Rehabilitation of Offenders in Connecticut, that

"Several research studies have shown that custodial staff may have the greatest impact on offenders, yet they are usually the least trained and exhibit the most negative attitudes toward inmates of all correctional personnel. The officers typically view their roles as 'keeping the inmates in line' and 'making sure they don't try and pull anything'. Their attitudes toward and constant surveillance of prisoners tend to degrade and disparage the inmates."⁸⁵

Within the last two years the State Department of Correction has made an effort to improve the training and qualifications of those working in the State's prisons. One recent program has been the hiring of more minority workers within the prison setting to ease the racial tensions and communication problems of white guards

⁸⁴ 1973 Criminal Justice Report, p. 36.

⁸⁵ Connecticut Planning Committee on Criminal Administration, The Rehabilitation of Offenders in Connecticut, 1972, p. 25.

and black inmates.⁸⁶ Since September of 1972 the State Department of Correction has taken steps to correct this problem by hiring more minority workers. As a result of their efforts there has been a 34.2 percent increase in the number of black and Puerto Rican workers in State Correctional facilities increasing the percentage of minority workers from 10% to 12.9% of the total correctional facility workers.⁸⁷ However, more importantly for the Central Naugatuck Valley Region, there had been a 46.5 percent increase in minority workers in those correctional centers to which offenders from this Region were sent in 1974 (Cheshire, Niantic, New Haven and Somers).⁸⁸ This program appears to be an excellent step toward improving prison conditions for minority offenders in particular, as well as for all other offenders.

d. Reintegration into the Community

However, the study emphasizes that changes in the attitude and behavior of correctional personnel are not enough. The offender must be able to function in a non-institutional setting and be able to readjust to his or her community. The State Department of Correction has said,

"It is patently absurd to think that social and physical banishment can ever achieve social reintegration. First it is no secret that any form of extreme environment whether it be a remote military outpost or a concentration camp, will probably have some deleterious effect even on the healthiest personality. Prisons are extreme environments. They are at once impersonal and unnatural. This combination together with even average personal problems would overwhelm most people. Nor does the prison experience disappear upon release. The ex-offender is mistrusted and shunned, often by his own family. Employment opportunities are usually limited to the most menial work even when the individual possesses special vocational or technical skills."⁸⁹

These problems are as true for juvenile offenders in the Region as for adult offenders. However, the problem of reintegrating an offender into his or her community may be most poignant for juveniles within the Region. Part of the problem is due to the lack of love and concern shown to juvenile offenders by their

⁸⁶ 1975 Comprehensive Plan, Volume II, p. E2-168.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ General Outline of the Proposed Correctional Master Plan and Female Pilot Program for Connecticut Department of Correction, p. 5.

immediate families. Another problem is due to the criminal justice system itself. Apparently, there are some problems with released juvenile offenders in the Region which are in part due to the lack of supervision and direction that juvenile probation officers are able to provide. The 1973 Criminal Justice Report indicates,

"The consensus seems to be that although juvenile probation officers are doing the best they can, their caseloads are simply too heavy for them to give the cases assigned to them as much attention as desirable. While the standard caseload is 25-40 cases, one probation officer stated that her caseloads sometimes reach fifty."⁹⁰

e. Diversion Programs

While improved supervision of released offenders is important, perhaps the most glaring problem is that most of the offenders who are sent to correctional institutions should not have been sent there in the first place. The 1972 CPCCA study of The Rehabilitation of Offenders in Connecticut states,

"One of the most pressing immediate needs for the Connecticut criminal justice system is for the development of alternatives to incarceration (or non-institutional correction measures)."⁹¹

Alternatives to incarceration appear to be a viable solution for most correctional inmates since a great number are incarcerated for crimes not directly associated with crimes against persons or property, such as alcoholism, drugs, and drug related offenses.⁹² The Niantic Correctional Facility for women has indicated that approximately 80 percent of its female offenders are involved in drugs or drug related offenses and that nearly all have severe family problems and low levels of education.⁹³ Similar profiles have been given of those offenders housed in male correctional centers. These drug and alcoholic offenders are only injured further by their stays in correctional institutions and there is little hope for improvement until they can be given non-criminal treatment in a non-institutional environment. One sign of improvement is a recent bill that will decriminalize alcoholic offenders as of 1976. Instead of being taken to a local jail, alcoholics will be taken to an acute detoxification center for medical treatment.

A center will be located in St. Mary's Hospital and will have 130 beds catering to alcoholics from the Waterbury area. This program will not only improve the treatment of alcoholics, but will reduce court caseloads by as many as 80 to 100 cases a month. State authorities in the State Department of Correction and the Judicial System are aware of the pressing need to divert offenders from

⁹⁰ 1973 Criminal Justice Report, p. 37.

⁹¹ The Rehabilitation of Offenders in Connecticut, p. 21.

⁹² 1975 Comprehensive Plan, p. A1-130.

⁹³ General Outline of the Proposed Correctional Master Plan and Female Pilot Program for Connecticut Department of Correction, p. 8.

the traditional rehabilitation system. Since the fiscal year 1970-1971 the State's correctional facilities have had a 16.6 percent drop in the average daily population serving time in the State's Correctional Institutions and Centers. This policy of diverting offenders from prison settings has also been espoused in the 1975 State Comprehensive Criminal Justice Plan.⁹⁴

Besides being (1) more humane and benefiting the offender, noninstitutional rehabilitation is considered to be (2) cheaper and (3) more effective than the present correctional system. Regarding the effectiveness of the noninstitutional approach, the CPCCA states,

"A study of the deterrent effect of criminal penalties in California, showed that lengthy incarceration does not deter crime or recidivism. Reducing incarceration time, in fact, was found not to lead to increased recidivism and, in some cases, reduced incarceration may even be associated with reduced offending (i.e., lower recidivism)."⁹⁵

If one considers the fact that in 1972-73 it cost the state government \$5,068 a year to send an offender to Somers Correctional Institution, present efforts to rehabilitate offenders in a community setting may also lead to dramatic cost savings.⁹⁶

However, efforts to save money should not be the primary emphasis of improved correctional programs. As an example, if more criminal cases are nolleed or if charges are consistently reduced in order to keep offenders out of prison, one may expect to find continuing, if not increasing problems of recidivism. For this reason judicial efforts aimed at reducing the cost of incarcerating an offender cannot be totally effective by themselves if there are no alternative noninstitutional correctional programs available for offenders. This points out the need for a coordinated approach to crime reduction and the rehabilitation of offenders among the various branches of the criminal justice system.

⁹⁴ 1975 Comprehensive Plan, p. A1-130.

⁹⁵ The Rehabilitation of Offenders in Connecticut, p. 22.

⁹⁶ 1975 Comprehensive Plan, p. A1-142.

f. Recent Rehabilitation Programs

At present all of the offenders serving time in correctional facilities and processed by the 4th Circuit Court and the Superior Court at New Haven County have access to a drug treatment program while serving their term.⁹⁷ In addition, those inmates residing in the New Haven Correctional Center also have access to a community release program.⁹⁸ This program is designed to ease the inmate's transition back into a community setting and strengthen his self-sufficiency. At present the program is geared to providing educational and work opportunities for inmates in the New Haven area. Community release programs and reentry programs for drug offenders are being supported by the 1975 State Comprehensive Plan.⁹⁹

A third important program being supported by the 1975 Comprehensive Plan and having an impact upon the criminal justice system within the Central Naugatuck Valley is a redirection center for nonadjudicated offenders. Most of those jailed in Connecticut prisons are jailed only prior to the disposition of charges against them which, according to the 1975 State Plan, accounts for around 70% of the total number of persons entering the accused detention population.¹⁰⁰ According to the

CPCCA the courts are willing to consider releasing these individuals as long as a pre-trial diagnosis and evaluation can be made of each detainee.¹⁰¹

A redirection center has been in existence in New Haven since 1971 serving pre-trial detainees from the Central Naugatuck Valley and providing them with legal and medical services. This LEAA program will continue to be funded in New Haven and is being expanded in Bridgeport.

7. REGIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACTION GRANTS

In 1969 the Connecticut Planning Committee on Criminal Administration (CPCCA) divided the State into 7 regional planning districts in order to insure that the

⁹⁷1975 Comprehensive Plan, Volume I, pp. Al-115-130.

⁹⁸Ibid.

⁹⁹Ibid.

¹⁰⁰Ibid.

¹⁰¹Ibid.

State Plan would be responsive to the needs of local government.¹⁰² The Western Connecticut Criminal Justice Supervisory Board as one of the 7 planning agencies in the State is responsible for the 13 municipalities of the CNV Region along with Bridgewater and New Milford.

Since Criminal Justice Planning, or perhaps more accurately, funding came into existence, the Central Naugatuck Valley Region has received \$1,308,587.¹⁰³ As can be seen from the Table below, with the exception of 1973 and 1974, the total awards allotted to the Region has increased annually.

LEAA Action Grants in the CNVR: 1969-1974

Year	Total Awards in Region	% of Total Connecticut Awards in Region	Total Awards in Connecticut
1969	\$ 11,732	3.9%	\$ 296,198
1970	173,745	6.5%	2,645,839
1971	207,291	2.0%	9,979,239
1972	454,153	3.3%	13,551,096
1973	272,211	1.9%	14,045,296
1974	189,455*	2.4%	7,895,000**
Total Awards	\$1,308,587	2.7%	\$48,412,688

*In some cases funding for 1973 Awards was carried over into 1974.

**\$831,000 of the total was allocated for corrections.

Source: Planning Committee on Criminal Administration and the Western Connecticut Criminal Justice Supervisory Board, 1975.

Between 1969 and 1974 these awards have been disbursed in a wide variety of areas covering crime prevention programs (\$112,383), communication systems (\$222,173), drug and alcohol programs (\$354,621), in-service training of police officers (\$39,111), a regional crime squad (\$76,983), police planning and administration (\$213,146) and youth programs in several of the Region's municipalities (\$184,995). These seven categories of funding accounted for 92 percent of the LEAA action grants received by the seven municipalities with organized police departments.

¹⁰²National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Criminal Justice System, p. 8.

¹⁰³Connecticut Planning Committee on Criminal Administration, Action Grants to Towns, 1969-1974.

between 1969 and 1974. The vast majority of the Region's action grants were disbursed to Waterbury and as can be seen from the categories listed above, drug programs, communication systems and police planning and administration received the greatest funding.

While it is difficult to evaluate the success of all the programs funded by the LEAA action grants, it appears that some of them have done exceedingly well. In particular, the regional crime squad and Waterbury's drug programs may have been responsible for part of the recent decrease in the number of drug arrests made in Waterbury and the Region. However, in the areas of juvenile delinquency and crime prevention, it is somewhat more difficult to assess the benefits of past funding efforts. Reported juvenile delinquency has not decreased and crime remains as much a problem as ever in all 13 municipalities within the Region. It is worth noting that twice as much money has been disbursed over the last 5 years for proving the communication systems of local police departments as has been spent on crime prevention or youth programs. The primary reasons for the paltry sums spent for crime prevention was due to the fact that (1) the Region's municipalities did not apply for monies allocated for crime prevention programs and (2) the LEAA and local police departments originally overemphasized police hardware and fancy communication systems. In addition, another area of the criminal justice system that needs to reevaluate its use of funds is the Correctional System. In light of the shortcomings of institutional rehabilitation programs for juvenile delinquents (i.e. Cheshire Reformatory) which all too often lead to a worsening of the juvenile's social outlook, it may be worthwhile increasing the amount of monies disbursed for the rehabilitation of juvenile offenders in noninstitutional settings within their own community (e.g., Amanda House in Waterbury).

One basic belief of the LEAA Action Grants is that improvements in a municipal police department will lead to decreases in crime rates. While there is evidence that increased expenditures for police protection may increase the number of crimes found within a municipality, it is not always clear whether an increase in the number of crimes reflects an increasing crime problem.

The complexity of evaluating crime statistics was highlighted by Clayton A. Hartjen in Crime and Criminalization. He states,

"At the most superficial level, crime rates and variations in these figures, both over time and from group to group, reflect a variety of factors other than the relative amount and variety of criminal offenses. For example, the proportion of police personnel to citizens seems to be an important factor. As the number of police increases, the probability that more crimes will be detected increases. Since more officials are looking for crime, more of it is likely to be found.

"It could be that the relatively high urban crime rate compared to the rural rate can be accounted for by the fact that a higher ratio of police is characteristic of urban areas. Of course, rural areas could have fewer police because the residents of these areas perceive less crime, and consequently less need for police, than do the residents of urban areas."¹⁰⁴

While increases in a municipality's crime rate may lead one to conclude that the general public is less safe than in previous years - some or all of the increase may be due to the fact that with LEAA funding, police departments have increased the manpower used to look for crime. For this reason one must keep in mind that it is not always easy to conclude simply by looking at crime statistics whether crime is a growing or decreasing Regional problem.

It is even more difficult to determine whether past LEAA action grants have had a positive effect in reducing specific types of crimes within the Region. Some crimes have decreased in some municipalities - most notably burglaries - while others have continued to increase during the past five years. Even if one assumes that Waterbury's crime prevention program has prompted Waterbury residents to take more care of their possessions than in previous years, there is no way of determining whether this program has had an impact on the number of burglaries committed in Waterbury.

For the year 1975 the CPCCA has established action programs for nine different areas of the Connecticut Criminal Justice System. Based on an examination of the program presented for 1975, there are very few municipalities within the Region which are eligible for new grants.¹⁰⁵ Only Waterbury is assured of its eligibility

¹⁰⁴ Clayton Hartjen, Crime and Criminalization, Praeger Publishers, New York, 1974, p. 169.

¹⁰⁵ Connecticut Planning Committee on Criminal Administration, Connecticut 1975 Action Programs, pp. 24-87 and 128-164.

for two programs being funded during 1975. The other municipalities of the Region appear to have very little chance of receiving new grants for the coming year. However, if they should be eligible, the only programs which appear likely are a youth services program, alcoholic treatment program, and a consolidation of specialized services and regional crime squads. As far as Waterbury is concerned the only two new programs for which they are eligible are (1) an experimental anti-crime project and (2) a youth service project. The outlook for LPAA funding in 1976 may be even bleaker than for 1975 since the LEAA may be cutting back on funding.

a. Ranking of State and Regional Criminal Justice Problems

Connecticut's Planning Committee on Criminal Administration (CPCCA) recently prepared its first comprehensive criminal justice plan for the state. While the CPCCA 1975 Comprehensive Plan is not a complete treatment of the criminal justice system, it has established goals for what they consider to be the eight major problem areas of the criminal justice system. At present the CPCCA has not fully established standards within its first plan because they feel the new administration may be interested in playing a role in the formulation of these standards.

The plan states,

"The delay (in the formulation of standards) increases the probability that well established goals, priorities and standards consistent with the new administration will endure over the course of this four year administration."¹⁰⁶

While the 1975 plan is really no more than an update of previous research efforts of the CPCCA, it does present a ranking of the eight program areas covered by the plan. The Table on the following page lists the State Comprehensive Plan's ranking of criminal justice problems alongside of the ranking of criminal justice problems established for Waterbury and the remainder of the Region. For one category, Organized Criminal Activity, there is no regional ranking since this problem falls within the purview of the State Police Department and is handled on a state level.

¹⁰⁶ 1975 Comprehensive Plan, p. B2-6a.

State and Regional Ranking of Criminal Justice Priorities: 1975

Category	State Rank	Waterbury Rank	Suburban Rank
1. Youth Crime and Delinquency	1	2	3
2. The Rehabilitation of Offenders	2	4	7
3. Communications and Informations Systems	3	7	5
4. The Equal Administration of Justice	4	3	6
5. Manpower for the Criminal Justice System	5	6	2
6. Street Crime and Police Service Functions	6	1	1
7. Organized Criminal Activity	7	-	-
8. Drug and Alcohol Abuse and Addiction	8	5	4

The category of Street Crime and Police Service Functions is ranked as the first priority in Waterbury and the remainder of the Region since street crime has noticeably increased in the last four years in all the Region's municipalities.

While Juvenile Delinquency is ranked third in the suburban municipalities it is ranked second in Waterbury because juvenile cases account for over 25 percent of the activity of the Waterbury Detective Bureau and juvenile court referrals from the Youth Bureau of the Waterbury Police Department have increased 15 percent between 1973 and 1974.

The increasing number of street crimes in Waterbury means that increased emphases must also be placed on improving the efficient and fair processing of court cases in the Waterbury courts. Since Waterbury places the greatest burden on the Waterbury courts, the program category "Equal Administration of Justice" is ranked third in Waterbury and sixth in the suburban municipalities.

The Rehabilitation of Offenders is ranked fourth in Waterbury and seventh in the suburban municipalities because Waterbury's street crimes are more serious in nature and require more serious rehabilitation programs for offenders than those in the remainder of the Region where most street crimes are crimes against property

and not against persons.

Drug and Alcoholic Abuse is ranked higher in the remainder of the Region than in Waterbury because to some extent the drug problem (especially hard drugs) has spread out of Waterbury into the suburbs.

Manpower is a pressing problem for some police departments in the Region. However, in Waterbury there is a greater need for more effective utilization of the present manpower than an increase in the size of the police force. As a result manpower is ranked as the second priority of the suburban municipalities with organized police departments while it is ranked sixth in Waterbury.

With the completion of the Waterbury Communication Center the program category

"Communication and Information Systems" is the lowest priority in Waterbury.

However, in the suburban municipalities it is somewhat more important, ranking as the fifth priority.

For each of these program areas the state has formulated goals to improve the criminal justice system. As of yet these priorities have not been set forth to specific municipalities or regions within the state which may have different problems and needs than those enumerated in the state as a whole.

The following section of this report, the 1975 State Standards and Goals has

modified and summarized where applicable to the Central Naugatuck Valley Region.

With the exception of Organized Criminal Activity, the Goals, Policies and

Objectives that are presented below cover all eight problem areas enumerated by

the 1975 Comprehensive Plan. They are intended to be a concise summary of all

the goals prepared by the CPCCA for the State of Connecticut in 1975. In addition,

specific policies and objectives not covered by the State Plan, but of relevance

to Waterbury and the Central Naugatuck Valley Region, are also presented.

XV-C. OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES - Criminal Justice

I. Youth Crime and Delinquency:

OBJECTIVE I: To reduce the amount of juvenile delinquency and the rate of recidivism of juvenile delinquents in the Region.

Policy I.1: Development of a coordinated approach to the prevention and rehabilitation of juvenile delinquency should be encouraged.

Policy I.2: To encourage the development of adequate dispositional alternatives for juvenile delinquents geared toward diverting these individuals from traditional confinement programs.

Standard I.2.1: Full support should be given to group homes for delinquents.

Standard I.2.2: Wherever possible vocational probation programs should be developed in order to ease the re-entry of offenders into the community.

Standard I.2.3: Community based facilities for treatment and prevention should be supported within the Region.

Policy I.3: Efforts must be made to promote the development of community based youth services as a substitute for incarceration of juvenile delinquents.

Policy I.4: Special efforts must be made to reintegrate the juvenile offender back into his or her community.

Standard I.4.1: Community attitudes toward juvenile offenders must be improved and community organizations must be encouraged to take an active part in programs geared to assisting the re-entry of these offenders.

II. Rehabilitation of Offenders:

OBJECTIVE II: To develop adequate dispositional and treatment alternatives for offenders by accelerating the development of community based treatment and rehabilitation resources.

Policy II.1: Efforts to reintegrate offenders back into the community must be combined with improved public response to the needs of these individuals.

Standard II.1.1: To encourage public education concerning the advantages and political benefits of reintegrating ex-offenders into the community.

Policy II.2: To improve the decision making on the disposition and treatment of offenders at all stages of their processing.

XV.-C. Criminal Justice - 1

Standard II.2.1 Special efforts must be given to screening and evaluating offenders at the pre-trial stage in order to divert them into pre-trial treatment or to be released on their own recognizance.

Standard II.2.2 Increased use of community and non-prison institutional settings are needed for treatment programs for criminal offenders.

Standard II.2.3 To encourage the provision of specialized parole services for offenders.

III Communication and Informations Systems:

Objective III: To improve communications between and within the Region's police departments and resident State troopers.

Policy III. 1: Efforts need to be made to improve the means of collecting, storing, managing and using information generated by the courts and police departments so as to provide better information when and where needed.

Policy III. 2: To standardize and coordinate all the Region's communication and information systems in accordance with the goals set forth by the State Plan on Criminal Justice.

Policy III. 3: To improve the communication systems of the Region's smaller municipal police departments to insure effective communication systems between the officers on the beat and police headquarters.

IV Equal Administration of Justice:

Objective IV: To improve the fair and efficient processing of cases disposed through the Region's court system.

Policy IV. 1: Efforts should be made to unify the trial court system to eliminate the distinction between the Court of Common Pleas and Superior Court in order to promote uniformity within the combined court.

Policy IV. 2: To encourage the maintenance of adequate manpower and supportive services for the prosecution and defense functions so that any exercise of discretion in these functions will result in an informed, rational and individualized decision.

Policy IV. 3: Reduction of pre-trial detention to an irreducible minimum and an equalization between the resources available to detainees and those available to released persons.

Policy IV. 4: Provision of sufficient dispositional alternatives to prosecution-incarceration particularly for offenders offering significant rehabilitative potential.

Policy IV.5: To develop means for rapid jury selection in order to have speedier trials by jury.

Policy IV.6: To encourage the introduction of night courts in order to ease the burden of caseloads and to make court appearances more convenient for the working man or woman.

V. Criminal Justice Systems and Operations: Manpower

Objective V: To improve the efficient utilization of manpower in the criminal justice system with special emphasis on improved training and greater use of civilian personnel.

Policy V.1: To develop a Regional capability in the courts, correctional institutions, and organized police departments to engage in research, planning and program development as well as a capability to evaluate and assess agency operations and activities.

Policy V.2: Development of police performance standards and criteria for entry, promotion and assessment of personal performance.

Policy V.3: Wherever possible, to encourage the hiring of civilian personnel in the Region's police departments to handle non-enforcement and clerical duties.

VI. Street Crime and Police Service Functions:

Objective VI: To improve the police response to street crime.

Policy VI.1: Improvements are needed in the Region's collection and handling of statistical data on street crime.

Standard VI.1.1: Uniform crime reports should be established in all municipalities with organized police departments.

Standard VI.1.2: Municipalities with resident state troopers should prepare reports of street crime to be submitted and included in the Town's annual report.

Policy VI.2: To decrease the utilization of police in non-enforcement functions.

Policy VI.3: To improve police patrol and surveillance in the Region at present levels of manpower.

Policy VI.4: To encourage the hiring of blacks and Spanish-speaking officers in the Waterbury Police Department.

Policy VI.5: To allocate certain police service functions such as inspecting unsanitary conditions and landlord-tenant relations to other municipal departments more directly concerned with these matters.

Policy VI.6: To consolidate or develop Regional support services for processing crimes requiring specialized detection or investigative skills beyond the scope of a small municipality.

Policy VI.7: To encourage the development of public education programs on crime prevention and promote the creation of police community crime prevention programs in those municipalities without such a program.

VII. Drug and Alcohol Abuse:

Objective VII: To prevent drug abuse among the general population and to treat drug abuse among the drug using population through the use of medical, social and educational services to these users and the imposition of appropriate legal sanctions against offenders.

Policy VII.1: With the exception of drug addicts who must be prosecuted for criminal offenses, all drug abuse and alcoholism offenders ought to be diverted from the criminal justice system in order to improve the treatment of the offender and expedite the judicial process.

Policy VII.2: Drug offenders must be given support when reentering the community. This measure is felt to have a considerable impact on the problem of recidivism among drug offenders.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, State-Local Relations in the Criminal Justice System, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., August, 1971.
2. Adult Probation Department, Fourth Annual Report, October, 1970.
3. Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Planning Agency, 1973 Comprehensive Criminal Justice Report for the Central Naugatuck Valley Region, October, 1972.
4. Connecticut Planning Committee on Criminal Administration, Street Crime, Order Maintenance and Police Service Functions, Hartford, Conn. 1972.
5. _____, Comprehensive Plan 1975, Hartford, Conn. 1974.
6. _____, Drug and Alcohol Abuse in Connecticut, Hartford, Conn. 1972.
7. _____, Youth Crime and Delinquency in Connecticut, Hartford, Conn., August, 1972.
8. _____, Manpower Problems of the Connecticut Criminal Justice System, Hartford, Conn., August, 1972.
9. _____, The Equal Administration of Justice, Hartford, Conn., August, 1972.
10. _____, Organized Criminal Activity in Connecticut, Hartford, Conn., August, 1972.
11. _____, The Rehabilitation of Offenders in Connecticut, Hartford, Conn., 1972.
12. _____, Connecticut 1975 Action Programs, Hartford, Conn., January, 1975.
13. _____, The Criminal Justice System in Connecticut 1972, August, 1972.
14. Connecticut Town and City, "Criminal Justice Notes", July, 1974.
15. FBI, Crime in the United States; Uniform Crime Reports 1973, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
16. Hall, E.T., The Hidden Dimension, Doubleday Anchor, Garden City, New York, 1966.
17. Hartjen Clayton, Crime and Criminalization, Praeger Publishers, New York, 1974.
18. Joint American Bar Association International Association of Chiefs of Police (ABA-IACP) Advisory Committee on Implementation of Urban Police Function Standards, The Urban Police Function, American Bar Association, Washington, D.C., 1974.
19. Manson, John R. Commissioner, General Outline of the Proposed Correctional Master Plan and Female Pilot Program for Connecticut Department of Correction, July, 1973.
20. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Criminal Justice System, Washington, D.C., 1973.

21. National Opinion Research Center, Field Surveys II: Criminal Victimization in the United States: A Report of a National Survey, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1967.
22. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, 1967.
23. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: Crime and its Impact - An Assessment, 1967.
24. Research Department, Greater Waterbury Chamber of Commerce, What They're Thinking in Waterbury, Waterbury, Conn., 1973.
25. State of Connecticut Circuit Court, Statistical Report 1972-1973.
26. Statewide Enforcement Coordinating Committee, Connecticut Regional Crime Squads, Annual Report, 1973.
27. Tri-State Regional Planning Commission, Law Enforcement Planning: Purpose and Future Role in the Tri-State Region, Interim Technical Report 4237-2020, June, 1971.
28. U.S. Bureau of The Census, 1970 Census of Population and Housing, Census Tracts: Waterbury, Connecticut SMSA PHC(1)-227, 1972.
29. John H. Herder Associates, Six Town Police Study, Hamden, Conn., July, 1973.
30. Department of Police, City of Waterbury, Annual Report, 1970-1974.

CENTRAL NAUGATUCK VALLEY REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

OFFICERS AND REPRESENTATIVES

CHAIRMAN:

Victor Allan, Bethlehem

VICE CHAIRMAN:

Sherwood L. Rowland, Waterbury

BEACON FALLS

John McGeever

BETHLEHEM

Victor Allan
Edmund Mierzewski

CHESHIRE

John Larson Campbell
Norman Maconi

MIDDLEBURY

Robert L. Bean

NAUGATUCK

Eugene Hertel
Joan Peterson

OXFORD

Robert Bowolick

PROSPECT

Denis Broderick
John Ricciardi, Jr.

TREASURER:

Robert L. Bean, Middlebury

SECRETARY:

Louis T. Alexander, Watertown

SOUTHBURY

Morris A. Huberman
Benjamin Robin

THOMASTON

Walter Kloss

WATERBURY

Frank T. Healey, Jr.
Rocco Pomponio
Sherwood L. Rowland

WATERTOWN

Louis T. Alexander
Stephen F. Jamsky

WOLCOTT

William Valletta, Jr.

WOODBURY

Donald C. Sanford
Boris Stasiuk

STAFF

CENTRAL NAUGATUCK VALLEY REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

Executive Director
Director
Regional Planner
Regional Planner
Regional Planner

Office Manager
Secretary

Duncan M. Graham
Alan Lessler
Peter G. Dorpalen
Virginia Mason
Charles Vidich

Helen P. Majewski
Peggy Stack